VOLUME 4. Parts 10/12
pp. 255—350.

9th June, 1950

WINCHES
395, HATFIELD ROAD,
ST. ALBANS, HERTS.

23 JUN 1950

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

	Page
The Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948 :	
Conclusions of Ninth Meeting (*concluding portion*) - - - - -	255-271
Conclusions of Tenth Meeting - - -	272-279
Conclusions of Eleventh Meeting - - -	280-305
Conclusions of Twelfth Meeting (*first instalment*) - - - - -	306-350

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature at the Publications Office of the Trust 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(*All rights reserved*)

later treated as the name of a subspecies and *vice versa*, so long as that species or subspecies is cited in its original nominal genus.

Article 25 (question whether a description of the work of an animal but not of the animal itself constitutes an " indication ")

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 16)

18. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a request submitted by Commissioner J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (file Z.N.(S.)140) for a ruling on the question whether the description of the work of an animal (for example, the borings made by a beetle), unaccompanied by any description of the animal itself or of any part of it constitutes an " indication " for the purposes of Article 25 (see Bradley, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 93–94), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in Point (45) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) the insertion in Article 25 of words to make it clear that the description of the work of an animal constitutes an " indication " for the purposes of Article 25, even if unaccompanied by a description of the animal itself and that a name so given is not to be rejected on the grounds that it is based upon a hypothetical form ;

(2) the addition to Article 25 of a *Recommandation* urging authors, so far as possible, to avoid giving names to new taxonomic units, where those units are based solely upon the work of an animal.

Article 25 (Question whether a generic name based solely upon a figure is published with an " indication ")

19. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a request submitted by Dr. Harald A. Rehder (U.S.A.) (file Z.N.(S.)68) for a ruling on the question whether a generic name based solely upon a figure satisfies the requirements of Article 25 (see Rehder, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 94–95), together with a note thereon published by the Secretary in 1945 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 95–96) and a supplementary note submitted by the Secretary in Point (46) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in Article 25 to make it clear that a generic name published prior to 1st January, 1931, on a legend to a plate or plates but without explanatory matter is to be treated as having been published with an " indication " for the purposes of Article 25.

Trivial name "aegyptiellus" Strand, 1909, conditionally published for a subspecies of "Halictus morbillosus" Kirchbaumer, 1873: status of, determined

20. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by the late Professor T. D. A. Cockerell (U.S.A.) (file Z.N.(S.)45) for a ruling on the authorship and date to be attributed to a trivial name published conditionally in the Order Hymenoptera (Class Insecta) (Cockerell, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 97), together with a note submitted by the Secretary in Point (47) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

that the point of principle raised in the application submitted had been settled by the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin at the time when *Opinion* 49 was under consideration and therefore that the trivial name *aegyptiellus* given conditionally as the trivial name of a subspecies of *Halictus morbillosus* Kirchbaumer, 1873, ranked for priority as from 1909, the year in which it had been published by Strand and is to be attributed to that author.

(*Previous reference : Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 17)

Article 25 (significance of the citation of the host species in an original description of a parasite)

21. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by President Karl Jordan (United Kingdom) (file Z.N.(S.)167) that a ruling should be given on the question whether the citation, in the case of a parasitic species, of the name of the host species, unaccompanied by any description of the parasite itself, constituted an "indication" for the purposes of Article 25 (see Jordan, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 97–98), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in Point (48) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that the citation of the name of the host species of a parasitic species, unaccompanied by any other particulars does not constitute an "indication" for the purposes of Article 25 but that the provision regarding the significance of the citation of a type locality in an original description which at the meeting noted in the margin they had agreed to recommend should be inserted in the *Règles* should be expanded to cover also the citation, in the case of a parasitic species, of the name of the host species.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 23)

Article 25 (significance of the citation of a geological horizon in an original description of a fossil species)

22. Arising out of the discussion on the preceding item, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the provision recorded in Conclusion 21 above should be extended to cover also the citation, in the

case of a fossil species, of the geological horizon in which the fossil was found, where no descriptive matter is given.

Article 25 (meaning of the expression " le plus anciennement designé ")

23. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Dr. Satyu Yamaguti (Japan) (file Z.N.(S.)125) that a ruling should be given regarding the manner in which the expression " le plus anciennement désigné " as used in Article 25 should be interpreted (see Yamaguti, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 102), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in Point (49) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the principal point raised by Dr. Yamaguti had been settled by the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin that there should be added to the *Règles* provisions prescribing the method to be followed in determining the exact date to be assigned, for the purposes of the Law of Priority, to any given book. It would be useful, however, if the Commission were now to deal with the position which arose when two competing names were found to have been published in different books on the same date.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 18)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing that, where two books, each containing a different name for the same taxonomic unit or the same name for different taxonomic units are published on the same day or, under the decisions taken by the present (Paris) Congress, are to be treated as having been so published, by reason of the exact date of publication of the books concerned being unknown, the question as to which of the two names is to be given priority over the other is to be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision.

Article 28 (relative advantages of the " First Reviser " and " Page Precedence " principles), Secretary to submit Report on

24. In the course of the discussion regarding the relative priority to be accorded to identical names published on the same day in different works recorded in the immediately preceding Conclusion, a discussion took place also on the cognate question of the provisions in Article 28 in its application to different names published for the same species, or the same name published for two or more different species, in the same book. It was generally agreed that the present wording of this Article was unsatisfactory. At the same time the view was expressed that it was desir-

able that consideration should be given to the practical difficulties involved in applying the " first reviser " principle laid down in that Article and that in this connection an examination should be made of the relative advantages on the one hand of retaining the " first reviser " principle and on the other of substituting for this provision a provision prescribing that in such cases relative priority should be determined in accordance with the principle of page precedence.

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 17)

At the conclusion of the discussion, THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to invite the Secretary to make a study, in the light of the foregoing discussion, of the problems involved in Article 28 and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, at the earliest possible moment.

Article 22 (Dr. Jacot's proposal that this article be deleted)

25. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)12) submitted by the late Dr. Arthur P. Jacot (U.S.A.) that Article 22 should be deleted from the *Règles* and that in its place there should be inserted a *Recommandation* that authors' names should not normally be cited (see Jacot, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 90), together with a counter-proposal submitted by the Secretary in the first part of Point (50) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to reject the proposal in regard to Article 22 submitted by the late Dr. Arthur P. Jacot.

Article 23 (proposal by the American Malacological Union that this Article be deleted)

26. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a Resolution (file Z.N.(S.)142) adopted by the American Malacological Union urging the deletion from the *Règles* of Article 23 (see Robertson, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 93), together with a counter-proposal submitted by the Secretary in the second part of Point (50) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to reject the proposal in regard to Article 23 submitted by the American Malacological Union.

Article 1 and Articles 34 & 35 : co-ordination of, in relation to the names of species transferred from the Animal Kingdom to the Vegetable Kingdom

27. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that with the consideration of Point (50) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15, the Commission had concluded their examination of all the proposals affecting the interpretation of the *Règles* published in Part 5 of Volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* with the exception of a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)155) submitted by

himself (Hemming, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 103–106) on the interpretation of Article 34 in relation to the provisions in regard to the status of names of genera which were originally described as belonging to the Animal Kingdom but were later transferred to the Vegetable Kingdom. There was no real doubt, on any reasonable interpretation of the wording actually used in the substantive French text, that paragraph (3) of Article 1 (though a poorly-drafted provision) governed Article 34 and therefore that, where a genus, originally described as belonging to the Animal Kingdom, is later transferred to the Vegetable Kingdom, the generic name published for that genus retains its original status in zoological nomenclature for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy (Article 34). It would be well, however, to take advantage of the present clean-up of the *Règles* to make this clear. The same principle should be made clear also in relation to the application of paragraph (3) of Article 1 to Article 35 (i.e. to the Law of Homonymy in relation to specific names and specific trivial names).

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that the provisions contained in the concluding portion of Article 1 should be redrafted, so as to bring out more clearly that those provisions were concerned with the status in zoological nomenclature of the generic and specific names given to a species in the belief that that species belonged to the Animal Kingdom, when later that genus or species was treated as belonging to the Vegetable Kingdom ;

(2) that such drafting amendments should be made in Article 34 (generic homonymy) as might be necessary to ensure that it was consistent with Article 1 and that regard should be paid to the same consideration in the choice of the wording to be employed in the Article which (as agreed at the meeting noted in the margin) is to replace the existing Article 35 (specific homonymy).

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

Article 25 (authorship of *nomina nuda* and manuscript names when first validly published with an " indication ")

28. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) regarding the authorship to be attributed to a name, when first published with an " indication," in cases where the name in question had, prior to being so published, been either a *nomen nudum* or a manuscript name, together with a proposal in regard thereto submitted by the Secretary in Point (51) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

(*Previous reference : Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 18)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted either in Article 25 or some other part of the *Règles* to make it clear that,

when a name is validly published in conditions which satisfy the provisos to Article 25 and the name in question accordingly acquires rights under the Law of Priority and, prior to being so published, that name had either been published as a *nomen nudum* or had been a manuscript name, the name is to be attributed to the author by whom it was first published in conditions which satisfied the requirements of the said provisos to Article 25 and not to the earlier author by whom it had either been published as a *nomen nudum* or had been given currency as a manuscript name.

Article 30 (interpretation of Rule (g))

29. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) relating to the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 submitted by the Secretary in Point (52) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 72)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, since this proposal had been drafted, the point at issue had been dealt with by the Commission, when considering the proposal submitted in Point (11) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12. No action was called for, therefore, on the part of the Commission as regards the present proposal.

THE COMMISSION took note of the above statement.

Title to be given to the "Règles" as amended by the present Congress

30. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) relating to the title to be applied to the *Règles* as revised at the present Congress, submitted by the Secretary in Point (53) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that an Article should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing :—

(a) that the title of the *Règles* as amended by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held in Paris in 1948 shall be the " Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique, 1901–1948 " ;

(b) that the foregoing *Règles* may be referred to by the short title " *Règles*, 1901-1948 " ;

(2) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* revised as in (1)(a) above, repealing the *Règles* previously in force as from the date on which the revised *Règles* come into force.

Addition of a further Schedule or Schedules to the " Regles " for recording decisions by the Commission on the invalidity of books or names

31. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) regarding the method in future to be adopted for recording decisions taken by the Commission either (1) that a given work is not available or (2) that a given name or class of name (for example the class of name dealt with in *Opinion* 124) is not available, submitted by the Secretary in Point (54) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that decisions taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (a) that a given book is not available for nomenclatorial purposes or (b) that a given name is not available should be recorded in a further Schedule or, if found more convenient, in two further Schedules to be attached to the *Règles;*

(2) that it should be left to the jurists to determine the order in which the several Schedules to the *Règles* should be arranged.

(*Later reference : Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 19)

Words having the terminations " -idae " and " -inae " : restriction on use other than for names of families and subfamilies

32. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)200) submitted by Commissioner H. Boschma (Netherlands) proposing an amendment to the *Règles* to secure that words having the terminations " -idae " and " -inae," prescribed in Article 4 as the terminations for the names of families and subfamilies, shall not be used either (1) as names for suprageneric groups other than those respectively specified in Article 4 or (2) as names of genera or of units of lower rank, except where such a termination is required for a trivial name formed in the first declension in the genitive singular. At the same time also the Commission had before them a proposal on this subject submitted by the Secretary in Point (55) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15. In his application on this subject, Commissioner Boschma referred to the highly objectionable practice adopted by certain authors in coining names of the above kind as the names (for example) of sections of subfamilies and cited in this connection the use by Hancock (1906) of the name Bufonidae as the name of a section of the subfamily Tetriginae of the family ACRIDIIDAE (Class Insecta, Order Orthoptera).

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that provisions should be inserted at appropriate points in the *Règles:*—

(a) prohibiting the use of words having either the termination " -idae " or the termination "-inae" as the names of suprageneric groups other than

families or, as the case may be, subfamilies, and invalidating such names when published for such purposes ;

(b) prohibiting the use of words having either of the terminations specified in (a) above as the names either (i) of genera or (ii) of taxonomic units of lower rank and invalidating such names when published for such purposes, save in the case of a trivial name which consists of the name of a place or personage of which the nominative singular has the termination " -ina " or " -ida," cited in the genitive singular (as, for example, the trivial name *catharinae*).

Article 12 (redrafting of, to eliminate confusion between taxonomy and nomenclature)

33. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) for the redrafting of Article 12 of the *Règles* in such a way as to eliminate the confusion between taxonomic ideas and nomenclatorial facts which at present marred that Article, submitted by the Secretary in Point (56) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that Article 12 of the *Règles* should be redrafted on the following lines :—

When a specimen or specimens originally described as representing a species is or are treated by a later author as representing a subspecies, the name published as the specific trivial name of the species becomes the subspecific trivial name of the subspecies, and *vice versa*.

Article 7 (redrafting of, to eliminate confusion between taxonomy and nomenclature)

34. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) that Article 7 should be redrafted to eliminate the confusion between taxonomy and nomenclature implicit in the present wording, submitted by the Secretary in Point (57) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that Article 7 of the *Règles* should be redrafted on the following lines :—

When a species or group of species originally described as constituting a genus is treated by a later author as constituting a subgenus, the name published as the generic name for the genus becomes the subgeneric name of the subgenus, and *vice versa*.

Articles 6 & 11 : co-ordination of texts

35. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) that the discrepancy between the wording employed in the parallel Articles 6 and 11 of the *Règles* (a discrepancy which was undoubtedly due to inadvertence in drafting) should be rectified by amending Article 6 so as to bring the wording used in that Article into line with that employed in Article 11, submitted by the Secretary in Point (58) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that, in order to bring the texts of Articles 6 and 11 into line with one another, the words " *et recommandations* " should be inserted in Article 6 after the word " *règles.*"

Articles 19 & 32 : co-ordination of texts

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 12)

36. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled at this point that among the propositions submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) was one which also related to the formal co-ordination of two Articles of the *Règles*, which he suggested might be conveniently considered by the Commission at the present point. This proposition (file Z.N.(S.)352) aimed at securing that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that Article 32 did not impose any limitation on the generality of the provisions of Article 19 of the *Règles*.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to ensure the co-ordination of Articles 19 and 32 by making it clear that nothing in the last-named Article detracts from the generality of the provisions of Article 19.

Article 8 : (amendment of provision proposed in replacement of second "Recommandation"

37. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)253) submitted by Professor L. W. Grensted (United Kingdom) that *Recommandation* (2)(b) to Article 8, relating to the formation of a compound name where the words used in forming that compound name are of Greek origin, should be amended so as to eliminate the sentence condoning the formation of such a name in an incorrect manner, such a sentence being unnecessary and inappropriate in a non-mandatory provision such as a *Recommandation*. It was bad enough to have such a generic name as *Hippopotamus* which Linnaeus had presumably thought meant a " river-horse " but which, in fact, through being incorrectly formed, meant a " horse-river," but it was intolerable that an incorrectly formed name of this kind should be gratuitously referred to in a provision which was ostensibly concerned only to show the correct manner of forming compound names. At the same

time the Commission had before them a proposal on the same subject submitted by the Secretary in Point (59) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

It was pointed out in discussion that, since the foregoing proposals had been formulated, the Commission had agreed to recommend that the *Recommandations* to Article 8 should be converted into mandatory provisions. This decision made it necessary that in the interest of stability in nomenclature words should be inserted to preserve compound names consisting of words of Greek origin, even when formed in a totally incorrect manner (as in the case of the name *Hippopotamus*). It was suggested that this end might best be secured by confining to a bare enumeration of the permissible types of generic names the portions of *Recommandation* (2) to be made mandatory and by retaining as *Recommandations* the comments included in the present provision in regard to certain of the types of names there enumerated.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 15)

(1) that, when, as agreed at the meeting noted in the margin, the second of the two *Recommandations* to Article 8 was redrafted as a mandatory provision, that provision should be confined to a bare enumeration of the types of words there listed as words admissible for selection as generic names, together with appropriate examples, and that the comments which were at present attached to, or which at present constitute, items (a), (b), (c), (f), (h), (δ), (ϵ) and (ζ), (i), (j) should be given as *Recommandations* attached to the provisions relating to the items concerned ;

(2) that, in the case of category (b), the whole of the existing comment should be deleted, namely, the words " in which the attributive should precede the principal word," the examples cited immediately thereafter and the whole of the following paragraph (" This does not . . . *Biorhiza* ") and that, in place thereof, there should be inserted a *Recommandation* on the following lines :—

(*For a proposed addition to this " Recommandation ", See Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 20)

> Where a name consisting of a compound word is formed from words of Greek origin, the attribute should, if it expresses a quality, precede the principal word, but where it expresses either an action or an activity or a state, may either precede or follow the word with which it is conjoined.

Articles 34 & 35 : relative precedence to be given to generic and subgeneric homonyms and to specific and subspecific homonyms of the same date

38. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) for the conversion into a mandatory provision of the addition relating to the relative precedence to be accorded to homonyms of identical date made to Article 36 by the XIth International Congress of Zoology at Padua in 1930 which at present appears as a *Recommandation*, submitted by the Secretary in Point (60) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) pointed out that this provision was totally valueless in the form of a *Recommandation* only, and that it was only if it became a mandatory provision that it could have any practical utility. That this provision appeared in the *Règles* as a *Recommandation* and not as a mandatory provision might well be due to editorial inadvertence, for it was expressly stated in the Commission's *Opinion* 124, which dealt with another aspect of the same matter, that the provision in question was an " amendment to Article 36 ", a statement which would not have been correct if this provision had been no more than a *Recommandation*. In any case this *Recommandation* was quite inappropriately placed in Article 36, to which it was unrelated in subject.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the provision relating to homonyms of identical date added by the Eleventh International Congress of Zoology to Article 36 in the form of a *Recommandation* should be converted into a mandatory provision and that the portion concerned with generic and subgeneric names should be related to Article 34 and that concerned with specific and subspecific trivial names to Article 35, when the last-named Article was redrafted in accordance with the decision already taken at the meeting noted in the margin.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

Article 36 (re-allocation to Articles 34 and 35 of " Recommandations ")

Previous reference : Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 1)

39. Arising out of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 38 above, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that, when Article 36 was redrafted in accordance with the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin, the provisions which at present appear as *Recommandations* attached to that Article should, subject to any necessary drafting amendments, be allocated respectively to Article 34, so far as generic names are concerned, and to Article 35, so far as trivial names are concerned ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 9)

(2) that, consequential upon the recommendation agreed to be submitted to give effect to a correction made in Article 4 by the Eighth International

Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Graz in 1910, a corresponding correction (by the substitution of the word "*thème*" for the word "*radical*") should be made in the third and fourth of the unnumbered *Recommandations* at present attached to Article 36.

Status of certain alleged subgeneric names : completion of decision given in " Opinion " 124

(Later reference : Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion 9)

40. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)394) for the completion of the decision regarding the status of certain terms, published in circumstances which had something of the appearance of giving to those names a subgeneric status recorded in *Opinion* 124, submitted by the Secretary in Point (61) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that this question, which had first been raised by Dr. Ashley B. Gurney (U.S.A.), was one of a number which arose in connection with the failure of the Commission on some occasions in the past to deal in their *Opinions* with the whole of a given problem submitted to them for decision. A proposal for dealing with this anomaly had been received from Commissioner H. Boschma (Netherlands) and would be brought before the Commission at a later meeting. In the case of *Opinion* 124, the defect which required to be rectified was that, as worded, that *Opinion* applied only to terms of the class in question (alleged subgeneric names), as published by Linnaeus in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae*, whereas the decision in that *Opinion* should have covered the use of such terms in all the works of Linnaeus, for, when he used such terms in other works, he always did so in a sense similar to that adopted in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae*. It was desirable also that, when the Commission made this correction, they should extend the decision in regard to the use of the terms in question by Linnaeus to cover the use of the same or similar terms by Fabricius (J.C.), who in this matter had followed a practice exactly parallel to that adopted by Linnaeus.

(Later reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting Conclusion 2)

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, where in any of his works (and not merely in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae*) Linnaeus, when citing the name of a species, placed an intermediate term or intermediate terms between the name of the genus and the trivial name of the species, an intermediate term so used was not to be treated as having thereby acquired the status of a subgeneric name as from the date of being so published ;

(2) that the decision set out in (1) above applies also to intermediate terms placed between the generic name and the trivial name of a species by Fabricius (J.C.) in any of his works ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decision specified in (1) and (2) above.

" Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " : status of names placed on

41. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* clarifying the status of a generic name, once it has been placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ", submitted by the Secretary in Point (62) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) observed that the object of this proposal was to lay down clearly the status of a generic name once it was placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ". This proposal did not prejudge in any way the general investigation into the problem of finding ways and means for stabilising zoological nomenclature, which at their meeting held that morning the Commission, at the request of the Section on Nomenclature, had undertaken to carry out before the next meeting of the Congress. All that the present proposal did was to provide a breathing space between the time when a mistake in the " Official List " was detected and the time when action was taken to correct that mistake.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 8th Meeting, Conclusion* 4)

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend that there should be inserted in the *Règles* provisions :—

(a) prescribing that, for the purpose of promoting the stabilisation of generic nomenclature, there shall be an " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ", on which shall be inscribed the following classes of generic name, each name being accompanied by the name of the type species of the genus concerned and particulars as to the manner in which that species was so designated, indicated, or selected :—

(i) every generic name validated by the Commission under its plenary powers or for which the type species has been similarly designated ;

(ii) the name of every genus, when an available name, in respect of which or its type species the Commission has rendered an *Opinion* ;

(iii) the name of any genus which the Commission, in consultation with specialists concerned, considers it desirable to stabilise ;

(b) directing that, when a generic name has been placed on the " Official List ", that name is to be used, in preference to any other name, for the species which is the type species of the genus so named, save that, where, as agreed at the meeting noted in the margin, the Commission, in order not to appear to prejudge a purely taxonomic question, place on the " Official List " the names of two or more genera, the respective type species of which are regarded by some systematists as belonging to different genera but by others as being congeneric with one another, the later published of the two generic names in question is for use only by those workers who regard the respective type species of the two genera concerned as not being congeneric with one another ;

(c) specifying that, where a generic name belonging either to the second or the third of the classes specified in (a) above is found, after having been placed on the " Official List ", either (1) not to be an available name or (2) not to be the oldest name available, there being an older name for a genus having as its type species a species either subjectively identified with, or subjectively regarded as being congeneric with, the type species of the genus the name of which has been placed on the " Official List " or (3) to have as its type species some species other than the type species attributed to it in the " Official List ", the generic name in question is nevertheless not to be discarded in favour of some other name or used in a sense different from that specified in the " Official List ", unless and until the Commission, on having the facts laid before it, shall so direct ;

(d) prescribing any other provisions relating to the " Official List " which the present Congress may enact in regard to the said " Official List " ;

(e) laying it down that it is the duty of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to maintain the said "Official List " and to foster its development by every means in its power ;

(2) agreed that the duties imposed upon the Commission in (1) above should be specified in the By-Laws of the Commission when revised in the light of the decisions taken by the present (Paris) Congress.

" Official List of Specific Names in Zoology " : establishment of, and status of names placed on

(*For a decision to alter the title of this " Official List," see Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 5)

42. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(G.)48), that there should be established an " Official List of Trivial Names in Zoology " parallel to the " Official List " established for generic names by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Monaco in 1913, submitted by the Secretary in Point (63) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) pointed out that, although the Plenary Powers Resolution adopted by the Congress in 1913 applied both to generic names and to trivial names, the " Official List " established by the Congress at the same meeting was concerned only with generic names. This was an anomaly which should be corrected. The " Official List of Trivial Names " now proposed would be an exact parallel of the existing " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and the status of names placed on these " Official Lists " would be subject to similar regulations. A reference to the new " Official List " would be needed in the body of the *Règles*. A parallel reference would be needed also in the By-Laws of the Commission, when revised in the light of the decisions taken by the present Congress.

In the discussion which ensued, general agreement was expressed with the proposal that there should be established an " Official List " of the kind proposed. It would provide a valuable means both for recording decisions taken by the Commission in regard to the names of particular species and also for stabilising the names of important species. The view was expressed however that it might be better if this " Official List " were given the title of " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology " rather than the title of " Official List of Trivial Names in Zoology ".

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) agreed to recommend the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions prescribing :

(a) that there should be an " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology ", parallel to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology", on which should be inscribed the oldest available trivial name of any species, the specific name of which it was desired should be stabilised, together with the generic name, in combination with which the trivial name in question was originally published ;

(b) that the status of a specific name, once placed on the " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology " shall be subject to regulations similar to those prescribed for the status of generic names placed on the " Official List for Generic Names in Zoology ", that is to say, a specific name once stabilised in this way is to be used in preference to any other name for the species in question and the trivial name in question is not to be replaced by any other trivial name, even if later it is found either (1) that the trivial name in question is not an available name or (2) that it is not the oldest available trivial name for the species in question, unless, and until, on the facts being laid before the Commission, the Commission shall so direct ;

(c) that the names to be included in the " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology " should include :—

(i) every name validated by the Commission under its plenary powers ;

(ii) any name, being an available name, on which the Commission has at any time rendered an *Opinion* ;

(iii) the name of the type species of any genus, the name of which is placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ", save where such a name is not, either objectively or subjectively, the oldest available name for the species in question, in which case there shall be added to the " Official List of Specific Names in

(For a later decision modifying the title of the " Official List " here established, see Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion 5)

Zoology " the oldest available name for the taxonomic species concerned ;

(iv) the oldest available name for :—

(1) species of importance in medicine, agriculture, veterinary science and other fields of applied biology, in stratigraphy and in the teaching of zoology ;

(2) species, the nomenclature of which the Commission, in consultation with specialists concerned, consider it desirable to stabilise ;

(d) that the insertion on the " Official List " of a given specific name is not to be interpreted as an expression of opinion on the taxonomic question whether the animal so named should be regarded as being on the one hand a distinct species or on the other hand a subspecies of some other species ;

(e) that it is the duty of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to maintain the said " Official List " and to foster its development by every means in its power ;

(2) agreed that the duties imposed upon the Commission in (1) above should be specified in the By-Laws of the Commission, when revised in the light of the decisions taken by the present (Paris) Congress.

" Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " : additional provision relating to

43. Arising out of the discussion in regard to the scope of the proposed " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology" recorded in Conclusion 42 above, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the recommendation specified in Conclusion 42(1)(c)(iv)(1) above in relation to names to be admitted to the " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology " should be applied also in relation to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology."

Tenth Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : date and time noted

44. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) proposed that, now that the Commission had completed their examination of the recommendations submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15, they should adjourn until the next day. As already announced, their next meeting, which would be held concurrently with the second meeting of the Section on Nomenclature, would take place on the morning of the following day (Saturday, 24th July, 1948) at 0900 hours.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 8th Meeting, Conclusion* 7)

THE COMMISSION took note of the above statement.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 2315 *hours*).

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st–27th July, 1948

CONCLUSIONS of the Tenth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Saturday, 24th July, 1948, at 0900 hours

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Second Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature*)

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. Hindle (United Kingdom)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

M. J. Aubert (Switzerland)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
M. Georges Deflandre (France)
Mme. Marthe Deflandre-Rigaud (France)
Mr. C. F. dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Fischer-Piette (France)
M. H. Gisin (Switzerland)
Professor R. Jeannel (France)
Dr. P. Jespersen (Denmark)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Dr. H. H. J. Nesbitt (Canada)
Mr. C. D. Radford (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
M. J. Segal (U.S.S.R.)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

Nomenclature of supergeneric groups below family level : communication by Prof. R. Jeannel

1. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication (file Z.N.(S.)357) submitted by Professor R. Jeannel (France) on the subject of the nomenclature of supergeneric groups below the family level[7].

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

that the problem of the nomenclature of supergeneric groups submitted by Professor R. Jeannel should be included among the matters to be dealt with in the Report on the problems arising in connection with Family and Sub-Family names which it had been agreed at the meeting noted in the margin the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to prepare for consideration by the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

Nomenclature of families and sub-families : Prof. R. L. Usinger's communication

2. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, were informed by Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.) that he did not now propose to make the communication (file Z.N.(S.)357), of which he had given notice, for, as this was concerned with the rules governing the nomenclature of families, it could, he thought, better be treated as forming part of the documentation which would form the basis of the Report by the Secretary, to which reference had just been made.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

that the paper on the nomenclature of families and subfamilies by Professor E. Gorton Linsley and Professor Robert L. Usinger which had been received from Professor Usinger should form part of the material to be studied by the Secretary to the Commission in preparing the Report which at the meeting noted in the margin the Commission had asked him to furnish for their consideration at their meeting to be held at the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

The concepts " grade " and " pseudo-genus " : communication by M. G. Deflandre

3. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication[8] submitted by M. Georges Deflandre (France), in which the applicant asked that the *Règles* should be amended to provide recognition of the concepts " grade " and " pseudo-genus " (file Z.N.(S.)363).

[7] For the text of the communication made by Professor Jeannel, see pages 164–165 in Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 28–29 in Volume 5.

[8] For the text of the communication made by M. Deflandre, see page 166 of Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 30–31 in Volume 5.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 13)

to take into consideration as soon as possible the proposal that recognition should be given in the *Règles* to the concepts " grade " and " pseudo-genus ".

Fragments (organites and sclerites) of fossil invertebrates : communication by M. G. Deflandre and Mme. M. Deflandre-Rigaud

4. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication submitted by M. Georges Deflandre and Mme. Marthe Deflandre Rigaud (France)[9], in which the applicants asked that the *Règles* should be amended so as to recognise a new system of terminology —the terms concerned to be those used in the Roman military hierarchy—for use for fragments (organites and sclerites) of certain fossil invertebrates (file Z.N.(S.)364).

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 14)

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to take into consideration as soon as possible the proposal that recognition should be given in the *Règles* for a new system of terminology for use for fragments (organites and sclerites) of certain fossil invertebrates.

Arachnid names published in Clerck, 1757 : proposal to make available : preliminary discussion

5. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France)[10] and similar communications received from M. Maurice Thomas (Belgium), in which the applicants asked that the Commission should make available nomenclatorially the generic name *Araneus* and the trivial names published for certain Arachnid species by Clerck in his *Aranei svecici*, notwithstanding the fact that those names were published in 1757, i.e. prior to the date prescribed as the starting point of zoological nomenclature in Article 26 of the *Règles* (file Z.N.(S.)238).

PROFESSOR PIERRE BONNET (FRANCE) said that the proposal which he laid before the Commission was one of the utmost importance in the study of Arachnology. That proposal aimed at securing an exception to the provisions of Article 26 in favour of the Arachnid names published by Clerck in 1757, the year prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature as prescribed by that Article. The precise form of the method to be adopted to secure this end was of indifference to himself and was primarily a matter for the Commission to determine. What was essential was to provide authority for the use of the names published by Clerck, for these names were used by the great majority of Arachnologists, and great confusion would result if an attempt were made to apply to the species

[9] For the text of the communication made by M. and Mme. Deflandre, see page 167 of Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 31–32 of Volume 5.

[10] For the text of the communication made by Professor Bonnet, see pages 173-176 of Volume 3, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 33-35 of Volume 5.

concerned the later names properly applicable thereto under the *Règles*. In many cases it was a matter of doubt what were the alternative names which should strictly be used, and in consequence the small minority of specialists who did not use the Clerckian names had found it necessary to cite not only the names which they believed to be the correct names under the *Règles* but also the corresponding Clerckian names, as it was only by so doing that they could ensure that Arachnologists reading their works would understand to which species they were referring. The 54 species named by Clerck were the commonest European species and prior to the adoption of the *Règles* the great majority of these names had been in universal use. It had been a grave error on the part of the authors of the *Règles* not to provide an exception in Article 26 in favour of the Clerckian names, notwithstanding the fact that they had been published one year prior to the date selected in the *Règles* as the starting point of zoological nomenclature. The application now submitted to the Commission in favour of action which would render the Clerckian names available was based upon a consultation which had been carried out with the 62 specialists in different parts of the world who today constituted the entire body of workers in the field in question. Of these specialists 54 had furnished statements of their views : 48 of these specialists had expressed themselves as being in favour of the present petition ; 4 were opposed to it ; 2 had considered themselves not sufficiently experienced to justify them in expressing an opinion. Of the 8 specialists who had not replied, 6 were nationals of countries with which for political reasons communication was difficult and their silence should certainly not be interpreted as indicating a desire on their part to abstain from voting on the present application. It would be seen therefore that there was an overwhelming consensus of opinion on the part of interested specialists in favour of the present application. In returning a favourable reply to the present application, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature would give much satisfaction to the great majority of the specialists interested in this group who already used the names published by Clerck and were anxious that this usage should now be officially approved. Such a decision would give satisfaction also to almost all of the small minority who did not at present use the Clerckian names but who had expressed themselves as most anxious to do so, if official approval were to be given to this course. The grant of the present application by the Commission would confer a signal benefit on the nomenclature of Arachnology and would redound greatly to the honour of the nomenclaturists of 1948.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the subject matter of the present application had constituted a serious problem in the group concerned long before the present *Règles* were adopted. It had not been found possible in the *Règles* to provide an exception in favour of Clerck's Arachnid names and in consequence it had not been possible to make any progress in this matter in the period between 1901, the year in which the *Règles* were adopted, and the year 1913, when the Congress had granted plenary powers to the Commission to suspend the *Règles* in cases where they were satisfied that greater confusion than uniformity would otherwise ensue. It was unfortunate that this case, which was admitted by all to be one of great importance to specialists in the group concerned had not long ago formed the subject of an application for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers. The long delay which had occurred in submitting such a request naturally made the problem more difficult of solution. Moreover, if the Commission were now to find it possible to grant the request submitted, they would equally have been able to so do thirty years before. Thus, the delay had caused also quite unnecessary inconvenience to all students of the group concerned and the expenditure of much unnecessary time on discussion of a question which could readily have been settled in one sense or another a generation earlier.

Continuing, the Acting President said that, in view of the exceptional interest of this case and of the special features which it presented, he considered that the best course would be to defer its further consideration until a later meeting of the Commission, in order to allow everyone who had heard Professor Bonnet's presentation of the case to consider the issues involved. He accordingly proposed that this application should be considered at a later meeting of the Commission to be held jointly with the Section on Nomenclature. In the meanwhile, he proposed to hand the dossier relating to this case to Professor di Caporiacco, whom he would call upon to make a further explanatory statement at the opening of the meeting when this matter was next considered.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 10)

to defer further consideration of the application that they should use their plenary powers to make available nomenclatorially the names published for certain taxonomic units in the Class Arachnida by Clerck in 1757, prior to the date fixed by Article 26 of the *Règles* as the starting point of zoological nomenclature until

a later meeting to be held jointly with the Section on Nomenclature on Monday, 26th July, 1948.

Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Congress on the work performed during its Paris Session

6. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had originally expected that it would be necessary to ask the Commission, as also the Section on Nomenclature, to meet again that afternoon and perhaps also in the evening. Both the Commission and the Section had, however, made such good progress in the consideration of the matters requiring their attention that it would not now be necessary to ask either body to meet again before the weekend. That this should be so would, he felt sure, be welcomed by the members of the Commission and the Section, some of whom, no doubt, desired to attend the function organised for that afternoon by the authorities of the Congress. A day and a half's break in the meetings of the Commission would also be most valuable to himself (the Acting President), for it would provide him with an opportunity to prepare the draft of the Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Congress on their work during their Paris Session, which, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, it was his duty to prepare for the consideration of the Commission. He proposed that, as on former occasions, the first part of the Report should be devoted to giving a succinct account of matters relating to the work and personnel of the Commission which had been dealt with since the last meeting of the Congress, including particulars in regard to such matters as changes in the membership of the Commission, together with the proposals of the Commission for the filling of certain of its offices which would fall vacant at the close of the present Congress, and for the filling of vacancies in the membership of the Commission arising from the completion of the term of service of the Class 1949. Second, he proposed that the Report should set out the proposals of the Commission for the reform of their composition and of their procedure and matters connected therewith. Finally the Report should deal with the question of the reforms which it had been agreed to recommend should be made in the *Règles*. It would not be necessary to refer in detail to the numerous minor changes which it had been agreed to recommend, for these had all been agreed with the Section on Nomenclature, to which, jointly with the Commission, the Congress looked for advice in such matters. It was however, desirable that the Report should give a general picture of the reforms proposed and in particular that it should refer specifically to the more important features of those reforms.

Turning to the question of the procedure to be adopted in considering the draft Report, the Acting President

recalled that the following Monday, 26th July, 1948, was the last day on which it would be possible to hold meetings of the Commission and the Section prior to the final *Concilium Plenum* of the Congress to be held on the morning of the following day, Tuesday, 27th July. In spite of the excellent progress made by the Commission and the Section during the past week, there still remained a large amount of work to be despatched if the full programme was to be carried through to a successful issue. It was essential therefore that the best possible use should be made of the limited amount of working time which still remained. To this end, he (the Acting President) suggested that the draft of the Commission's Report should be considered first at a meeting to be held jointly between the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature on the morning of Monday, 26th July. This procedure would have the advantage that, while affording the Commission the fullest opportunity for considering the document submitted for their consideration, it would also enable them to obtain the views and advice of the members of the Section on Nomenclature at a stage when their Report was still in draft and changes in wording and emphasis could be made in a way which would not be possible—except with considerable difficulty—if the Report were to be formally adopted by the Commission prior to its being brought before the Section. Under the procedure suggested the Commission would be able to make any changes in the draft Report which they might consider desirable and at the same time to incorporate in that document any suggestions for its improvement which might have been made during the joint consideration of the draft with the members of the Section. It should be possible in this way to secure the fullest agreement between the Commission and the Section on the Report to be submitted to the Congress and to do so in the promptest and most businesslike manner. At the present stage of the Congress this latter consideration was of great importance, in view of the large number of individual problems of nomenclature still awaiting decision.

THE COMMISSION took note of, and approved, the proposals submitted by the Acting President in regard to the procedure to be adopted in the preparation, and subsequent consideration, of the Report to be submitted to the Congress.

Eleventh Meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : date and time noted

7. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) then proposed that the Commission should adjourn for the day. As already announced, the next meeting of the Commission, which, like the present meeting,

would be held concurrently with a meeting of the Section, on Nomenclature, would take place on Monday, 26th July, 1948. The meeting would start at 0900 hours.

THE COMMISSION took note of the above arrangements.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 1210 *hours*).

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st-27th July, 1948.

CONCLUSIONS of the Eleventh Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948, at 0930 hours.

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Third Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature.*)

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. Hindle (United Kingdom)
Professor A. R. Jorge (Portugal)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor K. Mansour (Egypt)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
Mr. C. F. dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
Signor Antonio Valle (Italy)
Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*

Apology by the Acting President for late arrival

1. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) apologised for having kept the meeting waiting. The reason, as the Commission appreciated, was that, although ever since the close of the meeting on Saturday he had been engaged continuously on work in connection with today's meetings of the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature, he had only just completed the preparations necessary for that purpose,

Programme for the meetings to be held during the day

2. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) outlined the procedure which he proposed for the meetings to be held that day. In spite of the excellent progress made at the meetings held during the previous week, there remained a large number of matters awaiting the attention of the Commission. These included a considerable number of further proposals for the improvement of the *Règles* and also a large number of applications relating to individual problems of nomenclature which had been submitted to the Commission for decision. It was important that decisions should be taken on as many as possible of these applications: first, because the applicants concerned, many of whom—owing to the war and other causes—had been waiting for a decision for a number of years, were most anxious to secure a settlement of the problems which they had submitted to the Commission, second, because it was important that the Commission should decide as many of these cases as possible without further delay, in order to demonstrate to zoologists generally that they were capable of reaching definite decisions on cases which had been carefully prepared and properly submitted.

Continuing, the Acting President said that it would be necessary for the Commission—as also the Section on Nomenclature—to devote to the purpose the whole of the present day and in addition probably to meet again in the evening after dinner. All the meetings to be held that day would, like the present meeting, be concurrent meetings of the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature. This procedure would enable the Commission to reach decisions on the matters awaiting their attention in the presence of the members of the Section and with the assistance and advice of any members of the Section who might desire to take part in these discussions. Under this procedure, it would be possible to report to the Section recommendations agreed upon by the Commission directly they had been formulated. He proposed therefore from time to time to adjourn the meeting of the Commission, to enable him, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, to report to the Section recommendations and conclusions reached by the Commission.

THE COMMISSION:—

took note of the programme outlined by the Acting President and approved the proposals which he had submitted in regard to the procedure to be adopted.

Election of Professor K. Mansour (Egypt) to be an Alternate Member of the Commission for the duration of the Paris Session

3. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reported that, in accordance with the arrangement made at the first meeting of the Commission during its present Session, Professor K. Mansour (Egypt) had been invited to serve as an Alternate Member of the Commission during the present (Paris) Session of meetings, *vice* Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) who was unable to be present. This invitation had been accepted by Professor Mansour.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 1st Meeting, Conclusion* 6(2))

THE COMMISSION :—

took note of the above statement and welcomed Professor Mansour to their table.

(*The election of Professor K. Mansour to be an Alternate Member of the Commission was thereupon reported to the Section on Nomenclature*).

Withdrawal of Professor R. Spärck and nomination of Dr. H. Lemche as prospective Danish member of the Commission

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion,* 17(3))

4. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had to report that, much, as he felt sure, to the regret of all members of the Commission, Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) had intimated that on reflection he felt that pressure of his other duties, especially duties in connection with the next meeting of the Congress, would make it preferable that some other Danish zoologist should be nominated to be the Danish member of the Commission in succession to Dr. Th. Mortensen, whose resignation on grounds of ill-health had caused such regret to all members of the Commission. Discussions on this question had accordingly been held between the Danish zoologists present at the Congress, who had recommended that the vacancy caused by the withdrawal of Professor Spärck should be filled by the election of Dr. Henning Lemche. Dr. Lemche was well known to the members of the Commission not only through his published work but also on account of his active participation both in the public meetings of the Commission and in the meetings of the Section on Nomenclature during the present Congress.

THE COMMISSION :—

(1) took note with regret that on account of pressure of other work Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) had felt bound to ask for permission to withdraw his acceptance of nomination as the Danish member of the Commission in succession to Dr. Th. Mortensen (resigned on account of ill-health) ;

(2) agreed to nominate Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) to be the Danish member of the Commission as from the close of the Paris Congress in succession

to Commissioner Th. Mortensen (resigned) and to appoint Dr. Lemche to be an Alternate Member of the Commission for the remainder of the Paris Session *vice* Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) who had been unable to attend that Session.

(*Dr. Lemche thereupon took his place as an Alternate Member of the Commission.*)

(*The Nomination of Dr. Lemche to be a member of the Commission in succession to Commissioner Th. Mortensen* (*Denmark*) *vice Professor R. Spärck* (*withdrawn*) *was thereupon reported to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Congress : detailed examination of draft proposed

(*Previous reference: Paris Session,* 10*th Meeting, Conclusion* 6)

5. THE COMMISSION then turned to consider the draft of the Report to be submitted by them to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its final Plenary Session to be held on the following day (Tuesday, 27th July, 1948) (Commission Paper I.C.(48) 20), which, as arranged at the meeting noted in the margin, had been prepared for their consideration by their Secretary, Commissioner Francis Hemming.

After having satisfied themselves regarding the general scope and form of the proposed Report, THE COMMISSION, in conjunction with the Section on Nomenclature, examined the draft Report, paragraph by paragraph. In the course of this examination, THE COMMISSION, in agreement with the Section, signified their intention to make the undermentioned changes in the following paragraphs of the proposed Report —

Danish representation on the Commission and the arrangements proposed to be adopted in place of the system of three nine-year Classes in the membership of the Commission
Previous references: Paris Session, 11*th Meeting, Conclusion* 4 ; 3*rd Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

(1) *Paragraphs* 17 *and* 19.—These pargaraphs would need to be amended (*a*) to take account of the changes in the arrangements for Danish representation on the Commission which had just been agreed upon, and (*b*) to indicate (in the second of these paragraphs) the revised arrangements which, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been agreed to substitute for the existing system by which the membership of the Commission was divided into three 9-year Classes ;

Proposed " Official List " of names of species : title to be changed
(*Previous reference: Paris Session,* 9*th Meeting, Conclusion* 42)

(2) *Paragraphs* 44 *and* 45.—It was desirable that these two paragraphs, of which the first was concerned with the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and the second with the " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology," should be drafted in similar terms. Paragraph 45 should therefore be redrafted to correspond with paragraph 44. It was desirable to indicate the types of name which it was proposed should be placed on the new " Official List " and also to emphasise that the names to be

standardised in that "Official List" were the trivial names comprised in the specific names concerned, and to make it clear that, although the generic name with which any such trivial name was originally published must necessarily be included in the "Official List," such inclusion did not confer any status on the binominal combination in which that trivial name had originally been published or imply any view on the taxonomic question of the genus to which the species so named should be referred. For this purpose, it was desirable that the title of this "Official List" should be changed from the "Official List of Specific Names in Zoology" to the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology." It was desirable that an explanation on the foregoing lines regarding the scope of this "Official List" should be prefixed to this "List" when it was published. These points should be made clear in the revised draft of paragraph 45.

Verification of text of revised "Règles": an *ad hoc* Editorial Committee substituted for the Executive Committee of the Commission

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 12)

(3) *Paragraph* 47.—It was felt that, although this paragraph, as drafted, correctly represented both the recommendation which the Commission had submitted to the Section on Nomenclature regarding the procedure to be adopted after the Congress for seeing the revised text of the *Règles* through the press and also the conclusion thereon reached by the Section, the subject was of such great importance that it was desirable, if possible, to strengthen the arrangements that had been proposed. It was suggested that this end would be achieved if the duty of making a close examination of the draft text of the *Règles* prepared by the jurists were entrusted not to the Executive Committee of the Commission (as hitherto proposed) but to a specially appointed *ad hoc* Editorial Committee composed of three members (or Alternate Members) of the Commission who had been present throughout the discussions held in Paris. The duties involved were heavy, and it was felt that they could better be discharged by such a body than by the Executive Committee of the Commission, only one of the three members of which had been present at the Paris Congress. It was agreed that the change suggested was an improvement over the arrangement hitherto contemplated and that paragraph 47 should be redrafted accordingly. As regards the composition of the proposed *ad hoc* Editorial Committee, it was felt that a decision should be postponed until later in the day

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion* 62)

in order to permit of informal consultations for the purpose of bringing forward a proposal which would be generally acceptable.

At the close of the foregoing discussion, attention was drawn to the fact that, as the Commission was to sit continuously throughout the day, it might happen that they would wish to make some addition to their Report in the light of the further business which they would then have transacted. While it was agreed that it was desirable that the Commission should at once seek the approval of the Section on Nomenclature for their Report, that approval should be sought on two understandings. The first of these understandings related to the scope of the approval given by the Section to miscellaneous amendments of, and changes in, the *Règles*. The Report, as drafted, covered all such amendments or changes as had already been approved by the Commission and confirmed by the Section. In addition, however, there were other proposals for amendments and changes in the *Règles* awaiting consideration by the Commission and the Section. The reference in the Report to the approval of miscellaneous amendments of, and changes in, the *Règles* was therefore to be understood as applying not only to the amendments and changes already approved but also to any other such amendments or changes as might be approved by the Commission and confirmed by the Section either later during the present meeting or at meetings to be held later during the present day. Second, it must be understood that, if subsequent to the adoption of the Report by the Commission and of its approval by the Section, the Commission desired to include in the Report references to other decisions taken later in the day, they should be free to do so, provided that in every such case they obtained the approval of the Section for the insertion in the Report of the passage concerned.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) in the light of the discussion held jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, recorded above, to modify as follows the under-mentioned recommendations previously adopted, that is to say :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 42)

(a) to substitute for the recommendation agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, that the new " Official List " of the names of species should be given the title " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology ", the recommendation that the title to be given to this " Official List " should be the

" Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 12)

(b) to substitute for the recommendation agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, that the duty of examining the draft text of the *Règles* revised in accordance with the decisions of the Paris Congress, when that draft text was received from the jurists, should be entrusted to the Executive Committee of the Commission, the recommendation that this duty should be entrusted to an *ad hoc* Editorial Committee of three Members or Alternate Members of the Commission who had been present throughout the discussions held during the Paris Congress ;

(2) that, subject (a) to the incorporation in the paragraphs numbered 17 and 19 in the draft (relating to the Danish representation on the Commission and to the arrangements proposed to be adopted in place of the system of three 9-year Classes in which the membership of the Commission was at present divided) of the corrections noted in the discussion recorded above, and (b) to the redrafting of the paragraphs numbered 45 and 47 in the draft (relating respectively to the new " Official List " of the names of species and to the body to which should be entrusted the duty of examining the revised draft of the *Règles*, when received from the jurists) to conform with the conclusions respectively recorded in regard thereto in (1)(a) and (1)(b) above and subject also to the incorporation in the first of these paragraphs of the drafting amendments agreed upon in the discussion with the Section on Nomenclature recorded above, the draft Report prepared by Secretary Hemming (Commission Paper I.C.(48)20) gave full effect to the conclusions reached by the Commission during their Paris Session and to the action taken thereon by the Section on Nomenclature, and that a Report in these terms would provide the Congress with all the data required to enable it to judge of the results achieved during the present Session ;

(3) with reference to (1)(b) above, to request the Acting President to confer with leading European and American zoologists present at the Congress on the question of the composition of the *ad hoc*

Editorial Committee and to submit recommendations in regard thereto at a later meeting to be held in the course of the same day.

Unanimous adoption by the Commission of its Report to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology

6. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to adopt as their unanimous Report to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology the draft prepared by Secretary Hemming (Commission Paper I.C.(48)20), subject to the incorporation therein of the drafting and other changes specified in Conclusion 5 above ;

(2) to authorise and request Commissioner Hemming, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, to sign their Report, in the form unanimously approved and adopted in (1) above, and to submit it on their behalf to the Section on Nomenclature, with a recommendation that the Section :—

(a) approve and adopt each and all of the individual recommendations submitted in the Report ;

(b) agree :—

(i) that their approval to the passage relating to the adoption of miscellaneous amendments of, or changes in, the *Règles* should be understood as applying not only to such amendments and changes as had already been approved but also to any other such amendments or changes as might be adopted by the Commission and confirmed by the Section either later during the present meeting or at other meetings held later during the day ;

(ii) that if, as the result of further discussions either later during the present meeting or at other meetings held later during the day, the Commission desired to insert additional passages in their Report, they should be free so to do, provided that in each case they first obtained the concurrence of the Section for the addition so proposed to be made and that, on any such addition being so approved, Commissioner Hemming, as Secretary to the Commission,

should be authorised and requested to incorporate the addition in question, before the Commission's Report was submitted to the Congress at the Plenary Session to be held on the following day (Tuesday, 27th July, 1948);

(c) approve the Commission's Report as a whole, subject to the understandings specified in (a) and (b) above, and should authorise and request Mr. Hemming, as Secretary to the Commission, to submit that Report to the Congress at the Plenary Session to be held on the following day and, in doing so, to inform the Congress that the Report had been unanimously approved and adopted by the Commission, by whom it had been submitted to the Section on Nomenclature, by whom in turn it had been unanimously approved and adopted.

(*The Report of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature was thereupon submitted to the Section on Nomenclature for approval.*[11])

Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the "Règles": Fourth Instalment
(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

7. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary (Commission Paper I.C.(48)16), containing a fourth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment and clarification of the *Règles*. For convenience of reference these proposals, which were seventeen in number, had been numbered consecutively with the proposals brought forward in the paper containing the third instalment (Commission Paper I.C.(48)15). The present proposals were therefore numbered (64) to (80).

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

to examine Commission Paper I.C.(48)16, point by point, for the purpose of reaching conclusions regarding the recommendations to be submitted on the questions raised therein.

Article 32 (suggested amendment to provide for the rejection of trivial names on grounds of inappropriateness in certain cases)

8. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Mr. Philip P. Graves (Eire) (file Z.N.(S.) 205) that Article 32 should be amended so as to provide for the rejection of trivial names in certain cases on the ground that those names were totally inappropriate, having been selected by the original author as the result of a misapprehension on a question of fact (e.g. where a butterfly occurring only in the Philippine Islands was named

[11] For the record of the approval of the Commission's Report by the Section on Nomenclature, see page 89 of Volume 5.

californica by a credulous systematist who purchased an example labelled "California"), together with a note on the foregoing proposal submitted by the Secretary in Point (64) in Commission Paper I.C.(48) 16.

The view was expressed in the discussion on this proposal that, although at first sight this appeared a logical and desirable proposal, it was in fact one which contained a considerable element of danger. If Article 32 were to be relaxed in the manner suggested, it might lead to considerable instability in the case of trivial names based upon the names of countries, for it might lead to numerous requests for changes in such names, where, as the result of political changes, there were changes in the status of countries or parts of countries or changes in the names by which countries were known.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to reject the proposal that express provision should be made in Article 32 for the rejection in certain circumstances of trivial names on the ground of inappropriateness.

"Opinion" 124 : extension to cover certain terms intermediate between generic and trivial names published by Hübner (J.)

(*Previous reference : Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 40)

9. THE COMMISSION had under consideration :—

(*a*) a proposal submitted by Dr. R. Ferreira d'Almeida and Dr. José Oiticica Filho (Brazil) that in the case of names of species of the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) published by Hübner (J.) in volume 1 of his *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* in (apparently) trinominal form, as (for example) the name *Princeps dominans capys*, the trivial name (*capys*) should be accepted for nomenclatorial purposes but not either of the other names (i.e. in the example cited, the names *Princeps* and *dominans*) (file Z.N.(S.) 218) ;

(*b*) a letter addressed to Dr. Ferreira d'Almeida by Professor Charles D. Michener (U.S.A.) concurring in the proposal that in the case of names of the kind discussed in (*a*) above the intermediate term (for example, *dominans*) should be rejected and that the third term (for example, *capys*) should be accepted, but expressing the view that it would not be reasonable to exclude the first term (*Princeps*) from nomenclatorial availability as well as the second (file Z.N.(S.) 218) ;

(*c*) a proposal, that in the case of the names in question the intermediate terms (in the present example, the term *dominans*) should be rejected as not of subgeneric status by an extension to these terms

of the decision given by the Commission in *Opinion* 124 in regard to somewhat similar intermediate terms published by Linnaeus in 1758 in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* for species belonging to the same Order of the Class Insecta, submitted by the Secretary in Point (65) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (Mr. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the above system of nomenclature had been employed by Hübner not only in the *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* but also in the *Systematisch-alphabetisches Verzeichniss*, published in 1822. Whatever decision was taken should apply to both works.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, where in volume 1 of the work *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* or in the *Systematisch-alphabetisches Verzeichniss*, Hübner (J.) cited a species under a name having an apparently trinominal form (e.g. the name *Princeps dominans capys*), the generic name (*Princeps*) and the specific trivial name (*capys*) are to be accepted as satisfying the requirements of Article 25 of the *Règles* but that the intermediate term (*dominans*) is not to be treated as having acquired the status of a subgeneric name by virtue of having been so published ;

(2) to render an *Opinion*, supplementary to *Opinion* 124, embodying the decision specified in (1) above.

Addition to the "Règles" of a provision defining the functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

10. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.) 352) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* defining the functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, submitted by the Secretary in Point (66) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

In the foregoing paper the Secretary reminded the Commission that, among the provisions which, on the proposal of the Commission, the Section on Nomenclature had agreed to recommend the Congress to add to the *Règles*, were several provisions entrusting special duties to the Commission. In these circumstances, it was necessary that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision defining the functions of the Commission, for it would not be either logical or practicable to include in the *Règles* provisions conferring special duties upon the Com-

mission without having first defined generally the functions of that body.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (Mr. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the functions enumerated in Point (66) were all functions already entrusted to the Commission before the opening of the present Congress. To these must be added the function in regard to the rendering of *Declarations* on a new basis which has been agreed upon during the present Congress.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* defining the functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the following lines :—

(*a*) The centralisation, discussion and elaboration of all questions relating to zoological nomenclature are entrusted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which is charged with the following duties, in addition to such other duties as are prescribed elsewhere in these *Règles* :—

(1) the submission, as may be required, to the International Congress of Zoology (hereinafter referred to as the "Congress") of recommendations for the amendment or clarification of, or for the insertion of additional provisions in, the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique* (hereinafter referred to as the "*Règles*"), where, in its opinion, such amendments, clarifications or additions are required ;

(*Later reference Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion 16*)

(2) the preliminary consideration, on behalf of the Congress, for such a period, not exceeding one year, as in any given case the Commission may decide, of every proposition relating to a proposed change in the *Règles* which may be submitted to the Congress from any source ;

(*Previous references Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 9*)

(3) the rendering, during periods between successive Congresses, of *Declarations* embodying recommendations for changes in the *Règles* adopted by the Commission under (1) above in respect of proposals dealt with by the Commission during such periods ;

(4) the rendering of *Opinions* on questions of zoological nomenclature submitted to the Commission, the decisions embodied in which to become operative immediately upon the *Opinion* in question being so rendered, without further reference to the Congress ;

(5) the compilation of the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " and of the Official Indexes of Rejected and Invalid Names and the rendering of *Opinions* in regard thereto ;

(6) such other functions as have been, or may be, agreed upon by the present Congress ;

(b) The Commission possesses also plenary powers to suspend, in whole or in part, any Article of these *Règles*, other than the present Article, as applied to the names in any book or to any individual name, where, in its opinion, . . . (here should be inserted the provisions in regard to the use by the Commission of its plenary powers as agreed upon by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at Monaco in 1913, as amended by the present (Paris) Congress, together with all other provisions relating to the plenary powers agreed upon by the present (Paris) Congress.).

Article 25 (status of a holotype or lectotype in relation to an inadequate original description)

11. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)291) submitted by Dr. C. A. Hoare (London) that Article 25 should be clarified to indicate whether, where the original description of a species is poor and the identification of the species named therefore either difficult or uncertain—the case cited was that of *Trypanosoma suis* Ochmann, 1905—the type specimen, if available, can be called in aid to supplement the published description. At the same time, the Commission had under consideration a proposal in regard to this question submitted by the Secretary in Point (67) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

It was pointed out in discussion that Article 25 was concerned only with the nomenclatorial status of names ; for the purpose of that Article the taxonomic application of a name was irrelevant. The question of the taxonomic species to which should be applicable a specific name (published in conditions which satisfied Article 25) when there

(*Previous reference : Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 11)

existed a recognisable type specimen (holotype or lectotype) had been settled in connection with the amplification of Article 31 agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that in the forthcoming revision of the *Règles* a clear distinction should be drawn between (1) the question whether a given specific name was an available name in the sense that it possessed rights under the Law of Priority and (2) the question of the taxonomic unit to which any given specific name was to be treated as adhering, the first of these questions depending upon whether the name in question satisfied the requirements specified in Article 25, while the second was a matter to be determined in accordance with the rules laid down in Article 31.

Article 25 (priority to be accorded to a name in a work issued in instalments where that name is published on one date and the relevant description or part of it on a later date) : supplementary decision

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion* 20)

12. THE COMMISSION reviewed the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin regarding the priority to be accorded to a specific or generic name where that name is published on one date and the description or part of the description relating thereto is published on a later date, in the light of a note submitted by the Secretary in Point (68) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14. In this note the Secretary pointed out that special provisions of a rather more stringent character needed to be adopted in the case of generic names published after 31st December, 1930 (i.e. after Proviso (c) to Article 25 became operative) since, as regards these names, it was essential to make it clear that no name was to be accepted as having satisfied the requirements of the foregoing Article until a clear designation of its type species had been published.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the provision which it had been agreed at the Seventh Meeting of their Paris Session (Conclusion 20) should be added to Article 25, to make it clear that, where, in the case of a generic name published subsequent to 31st December, 1930, the description of the genus so named is published in two successive portions of a book or serial published in instalments, such a name is to rank for purposes of priority only as from the later of the instalments concerned, if the designation of the type species of the genus is not included in the earlier published of the instalments concerned.

The expressions " grade " and " pseudo-genus " : proposed recognition of, in the " Regles " : rejection of proposal

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 10th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

13. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)363) submitted by M. Georges Deflandre (France) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles*, recognising the categories " grade " and " pseudo-genus," together with a summary of a note thereon, submitted by the Secretary in Point (69) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, while the expressions " grade " and " pseudo-genus " had been found convenient by some palaeozoologists for certain taxonomic purposes,

those expressions were to be regarded as technical terms only and, as such, fell outside the scope of zoological nomenclature ;

(2) that, in view of (1) above, it would be inappropriate to include definitions of the foregoing expressions in the *Règles;*

(3) to render a *Declaration* recording the foregoing decision.

Proposed new system of nomenclature for fragments of fossil invertebrates found in sedimentary rocks : rejection of proposal

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 10th Meeting, Conclusion* 4)

14. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)364) submitted by M. Georges Deflandre and Mme. Marthe Deflandre-Rigaud (France) that provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing a special system of nomenclature to be applied only to certain fragments (organites and sclerites) of fossil invertebrates found in sedimentary rocks, together with the summary of a note thereon, submitted by the Secretary in Point (70) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, while for certain purposes palaezoologists might require to make use of a special system of terminology for denoting certain fragments, such as organites and sclerites, of fossil species of invertebrates found in sedimentary rocks where the fragments in question were not sufficient to form the basis of a taxonomic unit of a category recognised in zoological nomenclature, the expressions employed to denote such fragments were to be regarded as technical terms and not as zoological names and as such fell outside the scope of zoological nomenclature ;

(2) that, in view of (1) above, it would be inappropriate to include in the *Règles* provisions specifying and defining the terms to be used for the foregoing purposes and therefore that no term so published was to be recognised as having any status in zoological nomenclature ;

(3) to render a *Declaration* recording the foregoing decision.

Status of interpretations of the "Règles" given in "Declarations" rendered by the Commission in periods between successive Congresses

15. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* defining the status of interpretations of the *Règles* given by the Commission in *Declarations* rendered by the Commission in periods between successive Congresses, submitted by the Secretary in Point (71) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 9, *and* 11*th Meeting, Conclusion* 10)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that an Article should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that when, during a period between successive Congresses, the Commission give an interpretation of the *Règles* in a *Declaration*, the interpretation so given is to become operative immediately upon the publication of the said *Declaration* and is, until the next meeting of the Congress, to have like force and vigour as though it had already been embodied in the *Règles*, and that the proposed amendment or clarification of, or addition to, the *Règles* specified in the said *Declaration* shall be considered by the Section on Nomenclature at the next meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission thereby of a recommendation to the Congress that the *Règles* should be amended, clarified or extended in the manner indicated in the *Declaration* in question.

Method to be followed in amending the "Règles" : insertion in the 'Règles" of a provision regarding

16. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing the manner by which alone changes can be made in the *Règles*, submitted by the Secretary in Point (72) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that an Article should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing that no amendment in, clarification of, or addition to, the *Règles* may be made by the Congress, save on the recommendation of the Section on Nomenclature at Congresses where such a Section is established and in other cases on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature but that in the former case no such recommendation may be submitted by the Section on Nomenclature, unless the proposal that the *Règles* should be amended, clarified or extended in the manner proposed has been submitted to the Commission for a period of one year prior to the opening of the Congress or for such less time as in any given case the Commission may agree is sufficient and the Commission has submitted to the Section a recommendation as to the action desirable on the said proposal.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session*, 11*th Meeting, Conclusion* 10(*a*)(2))

Article 35 (polymorphism in trivial names arising from the use of the same

17. THE COMMISSION reviewed the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin to recommend the insertion in the *Règles* of a *Recommandation* urging authors to avoid publishing as the trivial name of a species a

word in noun and adjectival form): addition of a further example in "Recommandation"

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion 3*)

compound word having as its termination a word in noun form (e.g. *-costa*) where a similar compound word having as its termination the same word in adjectival form (e.g. *-costatus* or *-costata*) has already been published as the trivial name of another species in the same or an allied genus, and in this connection had under consideration a supplementary proposal submitted by the Secretary in Point (73) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the example afforded by the use of the noun-form "*cauda*" and the adjective-form "*caudatus, -a, -um*", should be added to the *Recommandation* which, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been agreed to recommend should be added to the *Règles* regarding the need for avoiding, so far as possible, the use in the same or allied genera of compound trivial names differing from one another solely through having as their respective terminations the same words in noun-form or adjective-form or *vice versa*.

Article embodying the plenary powers of the Commission: drafting amendment

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 7*)

18. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note submitted by the Secretary in Point (74) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16, drawing attention to the inadvertent inclusion in paragraph 6(2)(a) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)4, of a recommendation that, when the Plenary Powers Resolution of 1913 (*Declaration* 5) was embodied in an Article of the *Règles*, there should be embodied at the same time the fourth of the four Articles of which the foregoing Resolution was composed, this Article being concerned with a matter of great importance (collaboration between the Commission and groups of specialists), which, however, it would be inappropriate to deal with in the proposed Article.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the fourth of the four Articles which together constituted the Plenary Powers Resolution of 1913 should not be embodied in the Article which, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been agreed to recommend should be inserted as a new Article of the *Règles*.

Neotypes (erroneous statements regarding, deleted from "Opinion" 126)

19. THE COMMISSION had under consideration certain unfortunate *obiter dicta* included in *Opinion* 126 (relating to the status of new names in d'Orbigny's *Prodrome*), which were so drafted as to give the misleading impression that the Commission had already given a ruling on the status of neotypes, together with a proposal in regard

thereto submitted by the Secretary in Point (75) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the decision in regard to the status of new names published in d'Orbigny's *Prodrome* of 1850 (i.e. that the specific names published in the above work are available under the *Règles*, when accompanied by a description or indication) given in the " summary " to *Opinion* 126, should be incorporated in the appropriate schedule to the *Règles* ;

(2) in order to remove such misunderstandings as had arisen, expressly to place on record that, as in the case of other *Opinions*, the decision taken by the Commission in *Opinion* 126 was to be looked for only in the " summary " of that *Opinion* and that no observation contained in the body of *Opinion* 126 but not included in the " summary " thereof was to be regarded as recording a decision by the Commission as respects either the interpretation of the *Règles* or any other matter.

Article 8 (addition to be made to Section (*b*) of the second of the existing " Recommandations " prior to its incorporation in the " Règles " as a mandatory provision)
(*Previous references: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusions* 37 *and* 15)

20. THE COMMISSION reviewed, in the light of a recommendation submitted by the Secretary in Point (76) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16, the recommendation which, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been agreed to submit regarding the amendment of item (b) of the second of the two *Recommandations* at present attached to Article 8, prior to the incorporation of the provisions of that *Recommandation* in the *Règles* as a mandatory provision.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the generic name *Stenogyra* should be added as an example of the class of name referred in the first part of the *Recommandation* proposed to be attached to the substantive provision which it had been agreed, at the meeting noted in the margin, should be incorporated in the *Règles* in place of the second of the two existing *Recommandations* to Article 8, item (b), and that the generic names *Hydrophilus* and *Philydrus* should be inserted as examples of the class of name referred to in the second part of the proposed *Recommandation*.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 37)

Addition of paragraph numbers in the case of composite Articles in the " Règles "

21. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal that reference to Articles of the *Règles* containing more than one paragraph should be facilitated by the allocation to each such paragraph of a serial number,

submitted by the Secretary in Point (77) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16. In submitting this recommendation, the Secretary drew attention to the error fallen into by many authors through the lack of such paragraph numbers in the case, for example, of Article 14, where the first paragraph, which grammatically consisted of a single sentence, was divided into three subheads, lettered " a," " b," and " c " respectively, and where the letter " c " had commonly been cited as though it were a designation which governed the whole of the remainder of the Article which in fact consisted of two distinct and entirely independent paragraphs.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that, when the text of the *Règles* was revised in the light of the amendments agreed upon by the present (Paris) Congress, serial numbers should be allotted to each paragraph of any Article consisting of more than one paragraph.

Addition of serial numbers where there is more than one "Recommandation" in any given Article of the " Règles "

22. Arising out of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 20 above, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that, when the text of the *Règles* was revised in the light of the amendments agreed upon by the present (Paris) Congress, serial numbers should be allotted to *Recommandations* in cases where more than one such *Recommandation* was attached to any given Article.

Subdivision into paragraphs of Articles and " Recommandations " consisting of two or more sentences

23. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal that reference to the Articles of the *Règles* should be simplified by the subdivision into two or more paragraphs of those Articles which at present consisted of two or more sentences, each containing a separate provision, submitted by the Secretary in Point (78) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that, when the text of the *Règles* was revised in the light of the amendments agreed upon by the present (Paris) Congress, any Article and any *Recommandation* which consisted of two or more sentences, each containing a separate provision, should be subdivided into paragraphs, each containing only a single sentence and each serially numbered.

Article 30, Rule (e) (clarification of)

24. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a request received from Mr. R. G. Fennah (Trinidad, B.W.I.) (file Z.N.(S.)236) for an interpretation of the expression " *species inquirenda* " as used in Rule (e) in Article 30 of

the *Règles*, together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in Point (79) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the second section (section (β)) of Rule (e) in Article 30 of the *Règles* should be redrafted so as to make it clear that the species there referred to are species, regarding the taxonomic identity of which the author of the genus expressed a doubt at the time of the original publication of the generic name, either because the species concerned was or were unknown to him or because of difficulties in identifying it or them or for any other reason, other than that specified in Section (γ) of the same Rule.

Article 30 (expression to be used to denote a species designated or selected as the type species of a genus)

25. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted by the Secretary in Point (80) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16, that, in view of the widespread use of the expression "genotype" by geneticists in a sense entirely different from that in which that expression had been used in zoological nomenclature, a *Recommandation* should be inserted in Article 30 of the *Règles* urging zoologists to refrain from using that expression when referring to the type species of a genus.

In the discussion on this proposal, the point was made that the expression "genotype" had been used by zoologists to denote the type species of a genus long before it was used by geneticists. If therefore zoologists desired to retain the use of this expression, they would be in a strong position if they were to approach geneticists with a request that some other expression should be adopted in genetics. The general view was against an attempt being made to retain the use of this expression in zoological nomenclature. The expression "genotype," viewed as an attempt to latinise the concept of the type species of a genus, could not be regarded as a success; the expression was consequently far from clear in meaning; moreover, its use in zoological nomenclature was much less common now than formerly and its elimination would be welcome. The proposal that a *Recommandation* should be inserted in the *Règles* urging authors to abandon the use of this expression accordingly received general support.

At the same time the view was generally expressed that it was desirable not to stop short at giving this negative advice; it was desirable that zoologists should be given positive advice as to the expression which it was desired should be used to denote the concept in question. The relative merits of a number of expressions, such as "generitype," "generotype," etc., were discussed, but, as

the French and French-speaking zoologists present pointed out, all expressions of this kind were unacceptable, since it would be impossible to employ them in the substantive French text of the *Règles*, as, if so used, such expressions would be either incomprehensible or definitely misleading.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that, where in the *Règles* (as in Article 30) or in the Schedules thereto, it was necessary to refer to the concept of " a type species of a genus," the expression " espèce type," and, in the English translation, the expression " type species " should invariably be employed ;

(2) that there should be inserted in Article 30 a *Recommandation* urging zoologists when referring to the concept of the type species of the genus always to employ the expression " espèce type " or " type species " or strictly corresponding expressions in other languages and to refrain from using the expression " genotype " or any other expression for this concept.

(*At this point the recommendations adopted by the Commission in the course of the discussion of Commission Paper I.C.*(48)16 *were reported to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

" Necator " Stiles, 1903 (Class Nematoda), an invalid name inadvertently placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " in " Opinion " 66 : validation of, under the plenary powers

26. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, when, in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, he had checked the bibliographical references given in the *Opinions* in which names had been placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " in the course of preparing that " List " for publication, he had found that there were a number of errors in the entries concerned, errors which had led in some cases to erroneous citations of type species and in others to names which were actually invalid being placed on the " List." All these errors would need to be corrected in one way or another before the " List " was published and as many as possible of the cases concerned would be brought before the Commission during its present Session. One of the generic names in question had been referred to in a different connection in an earlier discussion and it would, he felt, be convenient if the Commission were now to consider this case (file Z.N.(S.)366).

Continuing, the Acting President said that the name in question was *Necator* Stiles, 1903, the name of a genus of Nematodes, which had been included in the first instalment of names placed on the " Official List " in 1915 (*Opinion* 66).

This name was invalid because, under the decision given in *Opinion* 125 (relating to *Borus* Agassiz, 1846—an emendation of *Boros* Herbst, 1797—and *Borus* Albers, 1850), *Necator* Stiles, 1903, must be regarded as a junior homonym of *Necator* Sclater and Saunders, 1896, an emendation of *Nicator* Finsch and Hartlaub, 1870, a genus in the Class Aves. Immediately upon making the foregoing discovery, he, as Secretary to the Commission, had consulted the late Dr. W. L. Sclater, who had informed him that no inconvenience would be experienced by ornithologists if the Commission were to suppress the name *Necator* Sclater and Saunders, 1896 (in the Class Aves), for the purpose of validating the generic name *Necator* Stiles, 1903, in the Class Nematoda, for the genus of birds concerned was always known by the name *Nicator*, the spelling originally used by Finsch and Hartlaub.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to suppress for all purposes the generic name *Necator* Sclater and Saunders, 1896 (Class Aves), an emendation of the name *Nicator* Finsch and Hartlaub, 1870 ;

(b) to validate the generic name *Necator* Stiles, 1903 (Class Nematoda) ;

(2) to confirm the entry of the name *Necator* Stiles, 1903, made in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " in accordance with the directions given in *Opinion* 66 ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* setting out the foregoing decisions.

Validation, under the plenary powers, of long-established use of the generic names " Tethys " and " Aplysia " (Class Gastropoda) and matters incidental thereto

27. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)22) submitted by Dr. H. Engel (Netherlands) that the Commission should use their plenary powers to validate the long-established usage of the generic names *Tethys* and *Aplysia* (Class Gastropoda), to designate the type species of those genera in a manner which would eliminate all further possibility of confusion in regard to the foregoing names, and to take certain other action incidental thereto.

In the discussion on this proposal, the view was generally expressed that a decision on this case was long overdue, both because of the importance of the names concerned and because of the excessive delays which had occurred in the handling of this case by the Commission.

COMMISSIONER H. BOSCHMA (NETHERLANDS) said that he shared the general view that a decision ought now to be taken by the Commission for stabilising the usage of the names *Tethys* and *Aplysia* ; he pointed out however that the application submitted asked also for decisions in regard to certain specific trivial names which were not directly concerned with the main problem at issue. He suggested that the Commission should deal as proposed with the names *Tethys* and *Aplysia* but that they should defer taking decisions regarding the portion of the application which related to specific trivial names not directly involved in the stabilisation of the foregoing generic names.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that it would be impossible to deal with the generic names *Tethys* and *Aplysia* without at the same time dealing with the associated question of the trivial names of the species to be designated as the type species of those genera. The question of the trivial names of the other species dealt with in the present application could however be dealt with separately at a later stage, although the adoption of this course would offend against the canon suggested by Commissioner Boschma in another case that the Commission should in future carefully abstain from their former practice of giving answers to a part only of any given application submitted to them for decision.

(*Later reference: Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion* 2)

IN FURTHER DISCUSSION it was generally agreed that the questions submitted in the present application in regard to certain specific trivial names, other than those of the species to be specified as the type species of the genera *Tethys* and *Aplysia*, might properly be deferred for later consideration, provided, first, that these matters were brought to a decision as soon as possible after the close of the present Session, and, second, that the postponement of a decision on this part of the application submitted should not be held available to be cited as a precedent for similar action on any future occasion.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that under Article 19 of the *Règles* the spelling of the generic name *Laplysia* Linnaeus, 1767 (*Syst. Nat.*) (ed. 12), **1**(2) : 1089) was to be emended to *Aplysia;*

(2) to use their plenary powers :—

(a) to suppress for all purposes the generic name *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10), **1** : 653) and any other use of that name, prior to the publication of the generic name *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767 ;

(b) to suppress, for all purposes, other than those of Article 35, the use in the genus *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767, of the specific trivial names *leporina* and *limacina;*

(c) to suppress all uses of the specific trivial name *depilans* in the genus *Aplysia* (emend. of *Laplysia*) Linnaeus, 1767, prior to its publication, in the combination *Aplysia depilans*, by Gmelin in 1791 (*in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13), **1** : 3103) ;

(d) to validate the generic name *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767 ;

(e) to validate the undermentioned trivial names and to direct that those names were to be used in preference to any other trivial names for the species respectively concerned :—

(i) the trivial name *depilans* as published in the binominal combination *Aplysia depilans* by Gmelin in 1791 ;

(ii) the trivial name *fimbria* as published in the binominal combination *Tethys fimbria* by Linnaeus in 1767 ;

(f) to set aside all type selections for the genera *Aplysia* Linnaeus, 1767, and *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767, made prior to the present decision, and to direct that the type species of these genera shall be the species specified below :—

Name of genus	*Type species*
Aplysia Linnaeus, 1767	*Aplysia depilans* Gmelin, 1791
Tethys Linnaeus, 1767	*Tethys fimbria* Linnaeus, 1767

(3) to place on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " the generic names *Aplysia* Linnaeus, 1767, and *Tethys* Linnaeus, 1767 (Class Gastropoda, Order Opisthobranchiata), with the type species severally specified above, and on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " the specific trivial names *depilans* Gmelin, 1791 (as published in the binominal combination *Aplysia depilans*) and *fimbria* Linnaeus, 1767 (as published in the binominal combination *Tethys fimbria* ;

(4) without prejudice to the general principle that decisions should be given by the Commission on

all questions raised in any given application and on the strict understanding that the action now to be taken should not be held available to be cited on any future occasion as a precedent in favour of dilatory procedure, to postpone for further consideration the question of fixing, under the plenary powers, the identity of the species to which the undermentioned specific trivial names should apply :—

fasciata Poiret, 1789 (as published in the binominal combination *Aplysia fasciata* Poiret, 1789, *Voy. Barbare*, **2** : 2) ;

punctata Cuvier, 1803 (as published in the binominal combination *Laplysia* [sic] *punctata* Cuvier, 1803, *Ann. Mus. Hist. nat.*, Paris, **2** : 310).

(5) to request the Secretary to the Commission to resubmit the portion of Dr. Engel's application relating to the names specified in (4) as soon as possible after the close of the present Session, with a view to a decision being taken by the Commission thereon without further delay ;

(6) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decisions specified in (1) to (5) above.

" Venus " Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pelecypoda) : designation of type species, under the plenary powers

28. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)189) submitted by Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (U.S.A.), that the Commission should use their plenary powers to set aside the designation of *Venus dione* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Venus* Linnaeus, 1758, and to validate the long-established usage of that generic name, by designating, as the type species, either *Venus verrucosa* Linnaeus, 1758, or *Venus mercenaria* Linnaeus, 1758.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to set aside all selections of the type species of the genus *Venus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Eulamellibranchia), made prior to the present decision and to designate *Venus verrucosa* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of this genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Venus* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species : *Venus verrucosa* Linnaeus, 1758), on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the specific trivial name *verrucosa* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Venus verrucosa*), on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

" Bulla " Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Gastropoda) : designation of type species of, under the plenary powers

29. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)190) submitted by Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (U.S.A.), in consultation with Dr. Harald E. Rehder (U.S.A.), that the Commission should use their plenary powers to set aside the designation of *Bulla naucum* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Bulla* Linnaeus, 1758, and to preserve the long-established usage of the name by designating *Bulla ampulla* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers to set aside all selections of the type species of the genus *Bulla* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Gastropoda, Order Bullomorpha), made prior to the present decision and to designate *Bulla ampulla* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of this genus ;

(2) to place the generic name *Bulla* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species : *Bulla ampulla* Linnaeus, 1758), on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " ;

(3) to place the specific trivial name *ampulla* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Bulla ampulla*) on the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " ;

(4) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decisions specified in (1) to (3) above.

(*At this point the decisions reached by the Commission in regard to the names* Tethys *and* Aplysia, Venus *and* Bulla *were reported to the Section on Nomenclature.*)

Twelfth meeting of the Commission during its Paris Session : time appointed

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion 2*)

30. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) then proposed that the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature should now adjourn. The next meeting which, like the present meeting, would consist of concurrent meetings of the Commission and of the Section, would be held at 1445 hours that afternoon.

THE COMMISSION took note of the above arrangements.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at* 1225 *hours*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 21st-27th July, 1948.

CONCLUSIONS of the Twelfth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July 1948 at 1445 hours

(*Meeting held concurrently with the Fourth Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature*)

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Professor K. Mansour (Egypt)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

M. Belloc (France)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
Dr. Isabel Gordon (United Kingdom)
Professor E. R. Hall (U.S.A.)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Dr. H. H. J. Nesbitt (Canada)
M. G. Ranson (France)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (United Kingdom)
Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*

"Gryphaea" Lamarck, 1801 (Class Pelecypoda), problem of type species of : communication by M. Gilbert Ranson

1. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication[12] submitted by M. Gilbert Ranson (France) on the question of the type species of the genus *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Pseudolamellibranchiata) (file Z.N.(S.) 365).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to defer for consideration after the close of the present (Paris) Congress the application submitted by M. G.

---

[12] For the text of the communication made by M. Ranson, see pages 168-170 of Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 96-8 of Volume 5.

Ranson in regard to the type species of the genus *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801 (Class Pelecypoda, Order Pseudolamellibranchiata).

Status of generic names published in books dealing with classification of taxonomic units down to the genus level but no further : case of Brünnich, 1771, " Zoologiae Fundamenta "

2. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a request submitted by Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom) that a ruling should be given on the question whether new generic names published by Brünnich in 1772 in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta* were to be regarded as complying with the provisions of Article 25, Proviso (b) (file Z.N.(S.)151). The text of Mr. Winckworth's application had been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in 1945 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 113–117, *facsimile*).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, while it was important that a decision should be taken on the status of the nine generic names published for the first time in Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, which formed the subject matter of Mr. Winckworth's application, it was much more important that the Commission should reach a decision on the question of principle involved in the acceptance or rejection of those names, namely whether an author was to be regarded as having applied the principles of binominal nomenclature (" appliqué les principes de la nomenclature binominale "), as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25, as amended by the present Congress, where, in the work in question, that author was concerned with general questions of classification and did not carry his analysis below the genus level. A new generic name published in such a book after 31st December, 1930, was clearly ruled out by the terms of Proviso (c), the proviso added to Article 25, with effect from that date, under a decision taken by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Budapest in 1927. The status of a new generic name published in such a work prior to 1st January, 1931, had never been clearly defined, and the present was a good opportunity for reaching a decision on this subject with a view to the submission to the Section on Nomenclature of a recommendation for the clarification of the *Règles* in this regard. On a point of detail, it should be noted that, subsequent to the publication of Mr. Winckworth's paper, the attention of the Commission had been drawn by Dr. Kurt Teichert (University of Western Australia) to the fact that the University of Copenhagen possessed a copy of Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, dated " 1771," as well as copies dated " 1772," the date cited by Mr. Winckworth. The two editions were identical except for the date on the title page. In view of this information, this book should in future be attributed to

the year 1771. The Acting President added that the Commission were very glad to have Mr. Winckworth with them that afternoon and he called upon him to present his application in person.

MR. R. WINCKWORTH (UNITED KINGDOM) said that in the *Zoologiae Fundamenta* Brünnich gave a general description in Latin (left-hand pages) and Danish (right-hand pages) of the classification of the Animal Kingdom, including tables of all the genera. He did not, however, cite the names of species, as regards which he stated in the preface: "Enumeratio specierum nimis foret prolixa." It was evident that it was only on the grounds of space that Brünnich stopped short at the genus level. He (Mr. Winckworth) asked the Commission to declare that the generic names used by Brünnich in the *Zoologiae Fundamenta* were available under Article 25 of the *Règles*. He asked also that one of the new names published by Brünnich, namely *Tonna* Brünnich, should be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" with *Buccinum galea* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species. The other new generic names published in the *Zoologiae Fundamenta* would need to be dealt with on their merits in the light of advice received from specialists, but it might be thought appropriate to suppress the name *Orthoceros* Brünnich, for, if *Nautilus orthocera* Linnaeus, 1758, were to be taken as the type species, it would run counter to the plan of Brünnich's book which was not concerned with fossils.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) suggested that it might be convenient to take a decision first on the general issue involved, and second, to take such decisions as might be considered appropriate in regard to individual names concerned. As to the nature of that decision, he was in full agreement with Mr. Winckworth that Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta* satisfied the requirements of Article 25 and that it was desirable that the Commission should render an *Opinion* to that effect. He was however of the opinion also that, in order to prevent the recurrence in the case of other books of doubts similar to those which had arisen in the present case, it was desirable that the Commission should recommend to the Section on Nomenclature that words should be inserted in the *Règles* clarifying the application of Proviso (b) to Article 25 in relation to books such as Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta*. The Acting President further observed that, as the Commission were painfully aware from their experience with Meigen's *Nouvelle Classification* of 1800, it was often very dangerous for the Commission to give a ruling that a given book was an available book without at the same time

examining the effect of that decision on the nomenclature of the group concerned, for such a decision, although perfectly correct, was capable of causing great confusion in nomenclature, unless appropriate preventive action were taken immediately by the Commission under its plenary powers. He accordingly suggested that the Commission should recommend to the Section on Nomenclature that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision prescribing that, where the Commission gave a ruling that a given book satisfied the requirements of Article 25, it should be the duty of the Commission, in consultation with specialists, to examine the names first published in that book and, having done so, to place on the appropriate " Official List " such of the names concerned as were nomenclatorially available and also the oldest available names for the taxonomic units concerned, except, where the adoption of any given name concerned would lead to instability and confusion in the nomenclature of the group concerned, in which case it should be made the duty of the Commission to suppress the name concerned under their plenary powers. It should be the duty of the Commission also to place on the appropriate " Official Index " any new name published in such a book that was either not available nomenclatorially or was not the oldest available name for the taxonomic unit concerned, together with any name which might have been suppressed under the plenary powers under the procedure suggested above.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, an author had published a new generic name in a work dealing with classification down to the generic level but no further, it was not necessary for the purpose of Proviso (b) to Article 25 that in the work concerned the author in question should have cited trivial names of species under that genus or other genera discussed in the book concerned, provided that it was evident that the author concerned would have applied the principles of binominal nomenclature for species if in the book concerned he had dealt with taxonomic units below the genus level ;

(2) to recommend that words should be inserted in Article 25, embodying, in relation to Proviso (b) to that Article, the interpretation given in (1) above ;

(3) to render an *Opinion* stating that, for the reasons given in (1) above, the generic names published in

Brünnich, 1771, *Zoologiae Fundamenta* complied with the requirements of Article 25 of the *Règles*;

(4) to recommend that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing that, where the Commission gave a ruling that a given book of previously doubtful status satisfied the requirements of Article 25, it should be the duty of the Commission, in consultation with specialists, to examine the names first published in that book and, having done so, (a) to place on the appropriate "Official List" such of the names concerned as are (i) nomenclatorially available and (ii) the oldest available names for the taxonomic units concerned, save, in the latter event, where, in the opinion of the Commission, the adoption of the name concerned would cause instability and confusion in the nomenclature of the group concerned, in which case the name in question should be suppressed under the plenary powers, and (b) to place on the appropriate "Official Index" any name found to be either not available nomenclatorially or not the oldest name for the taxonomic unit in question, together with any name or names suppressed under the plenary powers in accordance with (a) above.

"Tonna" Brünnich, 1771 (Class Gastropoda), placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology"

3. Arising out of the discussion on the proposal (file Z.N.(S.)151) in regard to the status of generic names first published in Brünnich, 1771, *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, recorded in Conclusion 2 above, THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to place the generic name *Tonna* Brünnich, 1771, *Zool. Fundamenta*: 248, 232 (type species: *Buccinum galea* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10), **1**: 734, designated by Suter, 1913, *Manual N.Z. Moll.*: 314) on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology";

(2) to place the specific trivial name *galea* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Buccinum galea*), on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology";

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions set out in (1) and (2) above.

The word "Cercopithecus," validated as a generic name as from Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Mammalia, Order Primates),

4. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that one of the names which, as matters now stood, was a name first published by Brünnich in the *Zoologiae Fundamenta*, was the name *Cercopithecus* Brünnich, 1771 (Class Mammalia, Order Primates). This

and type species designated, under the plenary powers

word had originally been published in the nominative plural (as "Cercopitheci") by Linnaeus in 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10), **1**: 26), as the name of a subdivision of the genus *Simia* Linnaeus, 1758. It possessed no status, however, as a subgeneric name as from that date, for in *Opinion* 124 the Commission had ruled that these infra-generic group names, as used by Linnaeus in 1758, were not to be accepted as of subgeneric rank as from the date of being so published. Unfortunately, however, in an earlier *Opinion*, *Opinion* 104 (published in 1928), the Commission had inadvertently accepted a proposal that *Cercopithecus*, attributed to Linnaeus, 1758, should be placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" (with *Simia diana* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species). This error must be rectified either by deleting the foregoing entry from the "Official List" or by validating it under the Commission's plenary powers. The latter course was the one which he (the Acting President) recommended. If this course were to be adopted no problem would arise in connection with the name *Cercopithecus* Brünnich, 1771.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

(1) to use their plenary powers to validate the name *Cercopithecus* as from Linnaeus, 1758, and to designate *Simia diana* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of this genus;

(2) to confirm, in the light of (1) above, the (previously erroneous) entry of the name *Cercopithecus* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species as specified in (1) above), made in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" in accordance with the directions given in *Opinion* 104;

(3) to place the specific trivial name *diana* Linnaeus, 1758 (as originally published in the combination *Simia diana* Linnaeus, 1758), on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology"; and the name *Cercopithecus* Brünnick, 1771, on the "Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology";

(4) to render an *Opinion* setting out the decisions recorded in (1) to (3) above.

"Limulus" Müller, 1785 (Class Arachnida, Order Xiphosura) placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" by "Opinion" 104, a synonym of "Xiphosura"

5. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) next drew attention to the fact that, as pointed out by Mr. Winckworth (1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1**: 116), one effect of accepting the new generic names published by Brünnich in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta* of 1771 was to validate as from that date the generic name *Xiphosura* Brünnich, with *Monoculus polyphemus* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species. This result was objectionable from two points

Brünnich, 1771 : situation so disclosed to be given immediate consideration

of view : (1) *Monoculus polyphemus* Linnaeus, 1758, was the type species of the well-known genus *Limulus* Müller, 1785, the name of which had been placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " by *Opinion* 104. In the circumstances now disclosed, that entry was seen to have been erroneous and must now either be validated (under the Commission's plenary powers) or cancelled. (2) The genus *Limulus* Müller belonged to the Order Xiphosura of the Class Arachnida, and it would be objectionable to have in an Order a genus bearing the same name (*Xiphosura* Brünnich) as that of the Order itself. It appeared to him (the Acting President) that this was a case where the strict application of the *Règles* would lead to greater confusion than uniformity, but he thought that it would be desirable that the Commission should take the views of interested specialists before reaching a decision. The matter was urgent, however, for it should certainly be settled before the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " (now in the press) was published in book form.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

that consideration should be given as soon as possible after the close of the present (Paris) Congress to the question whether the name *Limulus* Müller, 1785, erroneously placed on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " by *Opinion* 104 should be validated under the plenary powers or alternatively be removed from the " Official List ", and that to this end the Secretary to the Commission be asked to prepare a Report on this subject, with recommendations, for the consideration of the Commission.

" Orthoceros " Brünnich, 1771 : decision on postponed, pending further consultations with palaeontologists

6. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING), referring to the generic name *Orthoceros*, which now became an available name as from Brünnich, 1771, said that, prior to the opening of the present (Paris) Congress, he had had correspondence with Mr. Winckworth on the question whether it was desirable that this name should be suppressed by the Commission under their plenary powers. He had had also correspondence on this subject with Dr. A. K. Miller (U.S.A.), Dr. Kurt Teichert (University of Western Australia) and others (file Z.N.(S.)44). In view of the interest of palaeontologists in this name, he suggested that the Commission should at this point confine themselves to taking note of Mr. Winckworth's suggestion that the name *Orthoceros* Brünnich, 1771, should be suppressed for nomenclatorial purposes and should defer taking a final decision on this question until the views of palaeontologists had been more fully ascertained.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to invite the Secretary to complete as quickly as possible his consultations with palaeontologists on the action to be taken in regard to the generic name *Orthoceros* Brünnich, 1771, and in the light of those consultations and of the present discussion, to submit a proposal to the Commission for consideration.

" Manatus " Brünnich, 1771, " Rosmarus " Brünnich, 1771, and " Ammonia " Brünnich, 1771 : Report on, asked for

7. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that there were three generic names (*Manatus*, *Rosmarus*, *Ammonia*) which, in consequence of the decision which had just been taken (in Conclusion 2 above) that new generic names published in Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta* satisfied the requirements of Article 25 of the *Règles* were now seen first to have been validly published in the foregoing work. In accordance with the procedure which the Commission had agreed (in the same Conclusion) to adopt in such cases, these three generic names should either be placed on the appropriate " Official List " or " Official Index " or, as the case might be, suppressed by the Commission under their plenary powers.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to invite the Secretary to confer with specialists in the groups concerned with the purpose of submitting a Report, with recommendations, on the action to be taken in regard to the following generic names first validly published by Brünnich in 1771 in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta:* (1) *Manatus* Brünnich ; (2) *Rosmarus* Brünnich: (3) *Ammonia* Brünnich.

Brisson, 1762, " Regnum Animale " (status of generic names published in) : consideration of, postponed

8. In the course of the discussion of the generic names first published by Brünnich in 1771 in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta* recorded in the preceding Conclusion, THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) observed that the status of five of the generic names published in that work (*Lutra*, *Hyaena*, *Giraffa*, *Tapirus*, *Ceratodon*) could not be finally determined until a decision had been taken by the Commission on the status of the generic names published by Brisson in 1762 in the Second Edition of his *Regnum Animale*, for each of the five names concerned had been published by Brisson in the foregoing work and should be attributed to that author if the *Regnum Animale* were to be found to comply with the requirements of Article 25 of the *Règles*. If however it were necessary to reject that work, then Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta* was the

first work in which those names had been validly published with an indication by a binominal author. Continuing, the Acting President said that, as the Commission would recall, the question of the availability of names in Brisson's *Regnum Animale* had been submitted to them for decision in a brief note prepared by Dr. G. H. H. Tate (American Museum of Natural History, New York) (file Z.N.(S.)124), which had been published in 1945 (Tate, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 115). Having regard to the importance of this question to mammalogists and in view also of the rarity of Brisson's *Regnum Animale*, he (the Acting President), in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission, had come to the conclusion that a full presentation of the issues involved was desirable before a decision was taken by the Commission. He had accordingly prepared for the consideration of the Commission a paper on this subject, illustrated by *facsimile* reproductions of extracts from Brisson's book. This paper would be published as soon as possible in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. In the circumstances, he (the Acting President) suggested that the Commission should defer taking a decision on the status of the names in Brisson's *Regnum Animale* of 1762 until they had had an opportunity of studying the paper referred to above but that, in taking this decision, they should take note of the fact that, if the foregoing work were to be rejected as not satisfying the requirements of Article 25, the place in which the five generic names to which he had referred would be found to have been first validly published in conditions which satisfied the requirements of Article 25 would be Brünnich's *Zoologiae Fundamenta* of 1771

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to take into consideration the question of the status of generic names first published in Brisson, 1762, *Regnum Animale*, as soon as possible after the publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* of the paper on this subject prepared by the Secretary ;

(2) to take note that, if it were found that the above work did not satisfy the requirements of Article 25, the names of the undermentioned genera in the Class Mammalia *Lutra*, *Hyaena*, *Giraffa*, *Tapirus*, *Ceratodon* would be found to have been first published by Brünnich in 1771 in his *Zoologiae Fundamenta*.

" Hyaena " Brisson, 1762, " Lutra " Brisson, 1762, and

9. Arising out of the discussion on the item recorded in Conclusion 8 above, THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to defer, until a decision had been reached on the

"Meles" Brisson, 1762: postponement of proposal for addition to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology", pending decision on status of Brisson's "Regnum Animale" under Proviso (b) to Article 25

question of the availability of generic names published in Brisson in 1762, *Regnum Animale*, consideration of the proposal submitted by the late Dr. C. W. Stiles (file Z.N.(S.)177) (on which a note had been published by Secretary Hemming, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1**: 112–113) that there should be added to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" the names of three genera (*Hyaena*, *Lutra*, *Meles*) of the Order Carnivora (Class Mammalia) published by Brisson in the *Regnum Animale*, from species of which had been reported parasites common to Man.

Clerck, 1757, "Aranei Svecici": proposed validation for nomenclatorial purposes of the names published in: discussion on, concluded

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 10th Meeting, Conclusion 5*)

10. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) proposed that at this point the Commission should resume their consideration of the proposal that the names published in 1757 in Clerck's *Aranei svecici* should be accepted for nomenclatorial purposes, notwithstanding that, having been published before 1758, those names had been published before the starting point of zoological nomenclature, which had been submitted to the Commission at their Tenth Meeting (held concurrently with the Second Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature) by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) on behalf of a large group of Arachnologists. The Commission would recall that, on the adjournment of their earlier discussion of this problem, he (the Acting President) had handed the dossier relating to this case (file Z.N.(S.)238) to Professor L. di Caporiacco as the Arachnologist member of the Commission and had intimated that he would call upon him to open the discussion when the Commission reverted to the consideration of this problem.

PROFESSOR L. DI CAPORIACCO (ITALY) said that, in accordance with the request made to him by the Acting President at the tenth meeting of the Commission held on 24th July, he had carefully studied the whole dossier relating to the application for the validation of the names for certain species of spiders published in 1757 in Clerck's *Aranei svecici*. For the reasons which he proposed to place before the Commission he was satisfied that it was desirable that they should take appropriate steps, either under the plenary powers or otherwise, to validate these names.

It should be noted, first, that in his *Aranei svecici* Clerck used a strictly binominal terminology in describing the species dealt with in that work. The descriptions given by Clerck were fully recognisable: there was no doubt at all regarding the identity of the 68 nominal species concerned, of which 55 were to-day universally accepted as good species,

while the remaining 13 nominal species were perfectly recognisable synonyms of other species described by Clerck in the same work. When one turned to Linnaeus, one found that most of the species which he described would be unrecognisable, if in a number of cases he had not himself cited the names previously published by Clerck or if in other cases there had not been other sources from which it could be shown that the nominal species in question were synonyms of species described by Clerck.

Almost all Arachnologists since the time of Linnaeus had adopted the names published by Clerck and had attributed those names to Clerck, instead of adopting the names published by Linnaeus or, when the names were the same, attributing them to Linnaeus. Professor Bonnet had given some very interesting statistics regarding the number of times on which the names published by Clerck had been used by Arachnologists in preference to those of Linnaeus, prior to the year 1892 when it was laid down in the *Règles* adopted by the Second International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held in Moscow that the year 1758 was to be accepted as the starting point of zoological nomenclature. These statistics showed that during this long period the names published by Clerck were used three times as frequently as those published by Linnaeus.

In spite of the decision taken in 1892 there was no change after that year in the practice of Arachnologists in this matter. An overwhelming majority continued to use Clerck's names in preference to those of Linnaeus. In the 56 years concerned Clerck's names had on the average been used four times as frequently as those of Linnaeus. The balance of usage in favour of Clerck's names thus actually increased after 1892. It could be said that in modern times only the German and Hungarian Arachnologists had used the names published by Linnaeus in preference to those of Clerck, but even those Arachnologists had realised that Clerck's names were so much better known than those of Linnaeus that, in order to make themselves understood by other specialists, they had adopted the practice of citing Clerck's names in brackets whenever they used the Linnaean names.

Looking forward into the future, there was no prospect that the situation was likely to change with the passage of time. It should be noted that in all works dealing with the arachnological fauna of particular countries the names used were those of Clerck and not those of Linnaeus. Thus, when a young student first studied the Class Arachnida, he always became acquainted with the commonest European species under the Clerckian names; when he had become

thoroughly accustomed to using those names, it was unlikely that he would later be willing to abandon them in favour of those published by Linnaeus. Professor Bonnet had made an inquiry on this subject among all working Arachnologists. Of the 62 specialists consulted, 47 used the Clerckian names, while 13 used those of Linnaeus ; the remaining two, not being workers on the European fauna, had no occasion to use either the Clerckian or the Linnaean names. Professor Bonnet had been prevented by circumstances from obtaining replies from two of the specialists who used the Linnaean names, but, as regards the remaining 11, it was noteworthy that seven—that was, a substantial majority—had declared themselves as being in favour of the Clerckian names. Thus, out of the total of 62 specialists in Arachnida, four only had declared themselves as opposed to the adoption of Clerck's names. Of these, one was an Australian who had never dealt with the spiders of Europe, with which alone the names of Clerck were concerned, while another (Mr. Hull) used the trivial names of Clerck, while refusing to accept the generic name *Araneus* Clerck (or indeed the generic name *Aranea* Linnaeus).

As there was almost complete unanimity in favour of the validation of Clerck's names, it would be useful to examine the nature of the reasons advanced against that course. These were found to be two in number.

First, it was argued that Clerck's name "*Araneus*" was not a generic name, because he divided his "Genus Araneus" into a number of families. If this was a valid argument, then not only the generic name *Araneus* Clerck but also the genera established by Latreille, Walckenaer and some of the other early entomologists would have to be rejected, for they were all accustomed to divide their genera into what they termed families. The fact was that in the XVIIIth century and the early part of the XIXth century the expression "family" had an entirely different meaning from that which it had since acquired. Zoologists did not reject—and no zoologists had urged the rejection of—the generic names published by Latreille, Walckenaer and others on the ground that they divided their genera into families. There was therefore no reason why on this account the names published by Clerck should be rejected.

The second argument which had been advanced against the acceptance of Clerck's names was prompted by the fear of creating a precedent : once the inviolability of the year 1758 had been abandoned for one group, there was risk, it was argued, that specialists in other groups might ask for similar exceptions. Against this argument must be set the fact that there was almost complete unanimity among

Arachnologists in favour of an exception being made for Clerck's names, while the fact that the number of workers in other groups was much greater than the number of workers on the Arachnida made it virtually impossible to secure among, for example, malacologists or ornithologists (who would be the groups most likely to raise such proposals) the same degree of unanimity as was found among the 62 Arachnologists.

There was therefore no good ground for rejecting the request for the validation of the Arachnid names published by Clerck in 1757. On the other hand, the refusal of that request would mean that in the future, as in the past, the commonest European spiders would be designated either by names which were not in accordance with the *Règles Internationales* or be known by a double name (the Linnaean and the Clerckian). In either case, the result would be greater confusion than uniformity.

A LONG DISCUSSION then ensued in which general agreement was expressed in regard to the need for meeting the wishes of the applicants, and in which, in consequence, attention was concentrated upon the means to be adopted to secure this end. On the one hand, it was evident that any decision, to produce the results desired, must be such that it gave precedence to the Clerckian names over those published by Linnaeus in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae*, which, under the terms of Article 26 of the *Règles*, when read with the interpretation given in *Opinion* 3, was deemed to have been published on 1st January, 1758, and therefore prior to any other zoological work published in that year. On the other hand, it would be embarrassing to validate the Clerckian names as from the date of their publication in 1757, for this would run counter to another provision in Article 26, namely that 1st January, 1758, was to be taken as the starting point of zoological nomenclature. In the course of the discussion, a suggestion was put forward that the Commission should overcome these difficulties by using their plenary powers to prescribe that Clerck's *Aranei svecici* was to be deemed to have been published in 1758 on some date prior to the publication of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus, but this suggestion was rejected on the grounds that it would be objectionable deliberately to falsify the date of publication of a book, of which the true date of publication was well known. It was then suggested that, while it should be recognised that Clerck's *Aranei svecici* was published in 1757, it should be laid down by the Commission that for nomenclatorial purposes names published in that work were to be accorded priority (under Article 25) as from 1758 and were to be granted precedence

over names for the same taxonomic units (the genus *Araneus* and the species placed by Clerck in that genus) published by Linnaeus in 1758 in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae*. The view was expressed, however, that, having regard to the exceptional character of the present case, it would be preferable that the proposed decision should be expressly recorded in Article 26 as an exception to the general rule there laid down rather than that the Commission should act in this matter under their plenary powers (as they clearly could, if they were so to decide) and that the decisions so taken should then be recorded in the Schedule to the *Règles* set apart for the recording of decisions taken under those powers. It was important to mark in every possible way the exceptional character of the decision taken in the present case.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that a proviso should be added to Article 26 directing that, notwithstanding the general provisions of that Article, the generic name *Araneus* and the specific trivial names for species of the Class Arachnida published in 1757 in Clerck's *Aranei svecici* are to be treated as though they had been published subsequent to the starting point of zoological nomenclature and are to have priority as though they had been published in the year 1758 on some date prior to the publication of the 10th edition of Linnaeus's *Systema Naturae*.

" Bilharzia " Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, suppressed, and " Schistosoma " Weinland, 1858 (Class Trematoda), validated, under the plenary powers

11. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the following papers relating to the case of the generic names *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, and *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858 (Class Trematoda, Order Digenea) (file Z.N.(S.)138) :—

(a) an application received from Dr. H. Vogel, Institut für Schiffs- und Tropenkrankheiten, Hamburg, for a declaration that the generic name *Bilharzia* attributed to Meckel von Hemsbach, the first author by whom it was published, and with priority as from 1856 (the date on which it was published by that author) had precedence over, and should be used in place of the later name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, published for the same species (Vogel, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 193–194) ;

(b) a note by the Secretary to the Commission drawing attention to the fact that the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, had been placed by the Commission on the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology "

by a decision taken in their *Opinion* 77, and that, in consequence, the recognition of the prior rights of the name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856 (the existence of which was not known to the Commission when they rendered their *Opinion* 77) would involve the removal of the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, from the "Official List," and inviting interested specialists to inform the Commission whether they considered that in the circumstances the removal of the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, was desirable or whether it would be preferable, in the interest of avoiding confusion that the Commission should use their powers to suppress the name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, and to validate the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858 (Hemming, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1**: 195–196).

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that in response to the invitation contained in the paper published by himself in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in 1947 and of the notices on the subject to which it had given rise in the journal *Science*, 15 specialists had written to him on this subject, of whom one only was in favour of the strict application in this case of the Law of Priority and in consequence of the use of the name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, while 14 were in favour of the use by the Commission of their plenary powers to validate the name *Schistosoma* Weinland. Since his arrival in Paris, Professor K. Mansour (Egypt) had spoken to him in regard to this case and had indicated that he was in favour of reviving the use of the name *Bilharzia*. Of the specialists who had communicated their views on this subject, the two who favoured the name *Bilharzia* were British and Egyptian respectively, while of the 14 who favoured the suppression of that name in favour of the name *Schistosoma*, 12 wrote from the United States, one from Canada, and one from Great Britain. The Acting President added that it appeared clear to him that there was an overwhelming consensus of opinion in favour of the validation of the name *Schistosoma* Weinland. The Commission had placed that name on the "Official List" in good faith, believing it to be the oldest name for this important genus, it being then thought by all concerned that the name *Bilharzia* had not been published until 1859 (by Cobbold), i.e. not until a year after the publication of the name *Schistosoma*. They certainly would not have taken that action at that time, when the name *Bilharzia* (attributed to Cobbold) was in wide use if they had known what the true position was. In the 26 years that had elapsed since the name *Schistosoma* was

placed, though erroneously, upon the " Official List," that name had very largely replaced the name *Bilharzia;* new issues were therefore raised by the discovery that *Bilharzia* was the older name, for it was necessary to consider also the effect on medical literature of a reversal of the practice which for over a quarter of a century had been believed to possess the highest nomenclatorial authority. In view of the general sense of the advice received from interested specialists, he (the Acting President) recommended that the Commission should use their plenary powers to suppress the name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856, and to validate the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858.

The following are the names of the specialists who made representations to the Commission either in favour of the name *Bilharzia* or of the name *Schistosoma:*—

(1) *Specialists in favour of the name* Bilharzia :—

Professor E. T. Leiper, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Institute of Agricultural Parasitology, St. Albans, England.

Professor K. Mansour, Fouad University, Cairo, Egypt.

(2) *Specialists in favour of the name* Schistosoma :—

Dr. H. A. Baylis, British Museum (Natural History), Department of Zoology, London, England.

Professor Harold Kirby, University of California, Department of Zoology, Berkeley, Cal., U.S.A.

Dr. W. H. Wright, Chief, Division of Tropical Diseases, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, U.S.A.

Dr. Eloise B. Cram, Medical Parasitologist, Division of Tropical Diseases, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, U.S.A.

Dr. Louis J. Olivier, Senior Assistant Scientist, Division of Tropical Diseases, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, U.S.A.

Dr. Myrna F. Jones, Zoologist, Division of Tropical Diseases, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, U.S.A.

Dr. Mabelle O. Nolan, Zoologist, Division of Tropical Diseases, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, U.S.A.

Dr. T. W. M. Cameron, Director, Institute of Parasitology, Macdonald College of McGill University, Que., Canada.

Dr. M. S. Ferguson, U.S. Public Health Service, Communicable Disease Center, Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A.

Dr. Hugh Pankhurst, Gloucester, Mass., U.S.A.

Professor Ernest Carroll Faust, The Tulane University of Louisiana, School of Medicine, Department of Tropical Medicine, and Public Health, New Orleans, U.S.A.

Dr. David S. Ruhe, U.S. Public Health Service, Communicable Diseases Center, Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A.

Professor Deane P. Furman, University of California, College of Agriculture, Division of Entomology and Parasitology, Berkeley, Cal., U.S.A.

Professor Charles H. Blake, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Biology, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

In the discussion which followed PROFESSOR R. L. USINGER (U.S.A.) supported the proposal that the plenary powers of the Commission should be used to validate the name *Schistosoma* which had become deeply embedded in the literature relating to the Trematoda and in medical literature generally. Nothing but confusion would result if it were necessary to revert to the name *Bilharzia*.

PROFESSOR K. MANSOUR (EGYPT) said that this problem was one of special interest to Egyptian zoologists and Egyptian medical men, for it was in Egypt that the disease bilharziasis was of special importance; the name *Bilharzia* was still universally used in Egypt for the Trematode parasite concerned. Now that it was clear that the name *Bilharzia* had priority over the name *Schistosoma*, it should be brought back into universal use.

DR. ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY (U.S.A.) (a member of the Section on Nomenclature present at the meeting) strongly supported the proposal that the name *Schistosoma* should be validated. Any other course would lead to confusion in medical literature.

COMMISSIONER H. BOSCHMA (NETHERLANDS) expressed support for the proposal that in the circumstances the name *Schistosoma* should be validated, in spite of the fact that at one time the name *Bilharzia* had been much more frequently used.

PROFESSOR K. MANSOUR (EGYPT) said that he recognised that American workers used the name *Schistosoma* in preference to the name *Bilharzia*, but the medical problem involved, and therefore the nomenclatorial issue, was of much more direct concern to Egyptian workers who had never used the name *Schistosoma*. He recognised that the balance of opinion was in favour of validating the entry of the name *Schistosoma* on the "Official List." Nevertheless, this was not a proposal which he could support, and he would feel bound to vote against it.

THE COMMISSION, Professor Mansour dissenting, agreed :—

(1) to use their plenary powers :—

  (a) to suppress for the purposes of Article 25 the generic name *Bilharzia* Meckel von Hemsbach, 1856 (Class Trematoda);

  (b) to validate the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858 (Class Trematoda);

(2) to confirm the entry of the name *Schistosoma* Weinland, 1858, on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology";

(3) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) and (2) above.

Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the "Regles": fifth instalment

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 7)

12. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary (Commission Paper I.C.(48)17) containing a fifth instalment of miscellaneous proposals received from various sources for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. For convenience of reference these proposals, which were 13 in number, had been numbered consecutively with the proposals brought forward in the paper containing the fourth instalment (Commission Paper I.C.(48)16). The present proposals were therefore numbered (81) to (93).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to examine Commission Paper I.C.(48)17, point by point, for the purpose of reaching conclusions regarding the recommendations to be submitted on the questions raised therein.

The plenary powers of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: use of, in relation to particular purposes

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

13. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352), set forth in Point (81) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17, that words should be inserted in the Article which, as agreed at the meeting noted in the margin, the Section on Nomenclature had been invited to propose to the Congress should be added to the *Règles* in regard to the plenary powers of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, the object of the words so proposed to be inserted in the foregoing Article being to draw the attention of the Commission to the need for giving special consideration to certain classes of applications designed to promote stability in nomenclature.

In the ensuing discussion there was general agreement in regard to the foregoing proposal, but the view was expressed that the scope of the proposal should be expanded to cover cases where the resuscitation of a long-forgotten type designation or type selection of a genus would lead to the sinking in synonymy of a well-known generic name or to an alteration of the manner in which such a name should be applied.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that in the Article to be added to the *Règles* relating to the grant of plenary powers to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature words should be inserted enjoining the Commission to give special consideration to applications for the use of the plenary powers in cases where the applications in question are concerned either (1) to suppress for

nomenclatorial purposes some old long-forgotten or long-ignored work containing new names, the introduction of which would sink in synonymy names that are well established in current use, or (2) to suppress any long-ignored name, or in the case of a generic name, any long-ignored type designation or type selection where the acceptance of that name or, as the case might be, that type designation or type selection would in the first case sink in synonymy, or in the second case, sink in synonymy or alter the meaning to be attached to, some well-known name in current use.

The plenary powers of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : application to cases of doubt arising from impossibility of determining the species to which a given trivial name should apply

14. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted by the Secretary in Point (82) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17 that in the Article to be added to the *Règles* in regard to the grant of plenary powers to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature provision should be made not only to cover (as already agreed) cases where greater confusion than uniformity would result from the strict application of the *Règles* but also to cover those cases where, owing to the impossibility of determining to which of two or more species a given trivial name should be applied, a serious and irremediable state of confusion was inevitable unless the Commission were empowered to use their plenary powers definitely to select a given species to be the species to which the trivial name in question was to apply. It was explained that, although this proposal contemplated an extension of the plenary powers of the Commission, the extension proposed was concerned not with widening the field in which the Commission was empowered to authorise exceptions being made from the *Règles* but with providing a means by which the *Règles* could be strictly applied in those cases where, without the intervention of the Commission, the application of the *Règles* was impossible and doubt and confusion in nomenclature was inevitable.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that in the Article to be added to the *Règles* in regard to the plenary powers of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature there should be inserted words to make it clear that, included among the classes of case for which those powers may be used are cases where confusion exists and is likely to persist through the impossibility, in the absence of the use of such powers, of determining the species to which a given specific or subspecific trivial name should be applied.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : insertion in the "Règles" of an Article relating to composition of

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 10)

15. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note submitted by the Secretary in Point (83) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17, drawing attention to the fact that now that it had been decided to recommend the inclusion in the *Règles* of an Article relating to the functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (Point (66) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16), it was necessary also to include an Article dealing with the composition of the Commission and the method of electing its members. The Article should be in general terms but should specify the principal decisions in this matter taken by the Congress.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision dealing in general terms with the composition of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the method of electing its members, this provision to specify all decisions in this regard taken by the present Congress and to provide, *inter alia:*—

(*Previous reference Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

(a) that the Commission shall consist of such number of members, not being less than 18, as the Congress or the Commission acting on behalf of the Congress, may from time to time determine ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

(b) that one-third of the members of the Commission, being those members who have had the longest service as such since their election or, as the case may be, their most recent re-election as members of the Commission, shall vacate their membership of the Commission at each successive Congress and that the vacancies so created shall be filled by elections made by the Congress for such periods and subject to such conditions as may from time to time be determined by the Congress, members of the Commission vacating their position as such under the present section being eligible for immediate re-election by the Congress ;

(c) that the number of officers of the Commission, their titles and duties, shall be determined from time to time by the Congress and that, when at a meeting of the Congress, a member of the Commission who holds one of the said offices is one of the members of the Commission who, under (b) above, is required to vacate his membership, the office in question is to be deemed to have fallen vacant and shall be filled by the Congress by election from among the

members of the Commission, the retiring officer, if re-elected to be a member of the Commission, being eligible for immediate re-election to the office so vacated by him, and further that, until the Congress otherwise determines the Officers of the Commission shall consist of a President, a Vice-President and a Secretary;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 2*)

(d) that during periods between successive Congresses the Commission may, subject to (a) above, vary the number of members of the Commission and may, in the manner agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, elect zoologists to fill additional places so created, may fill casual vacancies which may occur in the membership of the Commission during such periods as the result of death, resignation or otherwise, such elections being made for such periods and subject to such conditions as the Commission may, subject to (b) above, from time to time determine, and may also, subject to (c) above, fill vacancies in the offices of the Commission which during such periods may arise by reason of any of the causes aforesaid;

(e) that, if, as the result of an emergency, it is not possible to hold a Congress at the appointed time, the Commission or the Executive Committee of the Commission, or failing which, the Secretary to the Commission, may assume and exercise such extraordinary powers as it or he may consider necessary to secure the continued existence of the Commission, provided:—

(i) that the powers so assumed shall not include the power to vary the *Règles* or to render *Declarations* or *Opinions* on behalf of the Commission;

(ii) that at the first Congress to be held after the end of such emergency the Commission shall submit a Report to the Congress regarding the extraordinary powers assumed during the emergency and the action taken by the Commission or, as the case may be, the Executive Committee or by the Secretary to the Commission thereunder;

(f) that, in filling places in the Commission, due regard is to be paid to the need for securing (i) that there is an appropriate balance in the

membership of the Commission as between different parts of the world and (ii) that there is an appropriate representation of different types of knowledge and experience (1) in the various branches of the Animal Kingdom as respects both living and fossil species and also (2) of the needs of workers not only in the field of systematic zoology, including palaeozoology, but also in such of the applied fields as are concerned with biological subjects.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : insertion in the "Règles" of an Article relating to the By-Laws of

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion* 10)

16. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note submitted by the Secretary in Point (84) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17, drawing attention to the fact that now that it had been decided to recommend the inclusion in the *Règles* of an Article defining the functions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (Point (66) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)16), it was necessary also to include an Article relating to the By-Laws of the Commission and specifying the extent to which the Commission was free to alter the provisions laid down therein.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* providing :—

(a) that the functions and composition of the Commission and its procedure and other matters concerned with the conduct of its affairs shall be governed by By-Laws to be adopted by the Commission, consisting in part of Organic Articles specifying those matters on which decisions have been taken by the Congress and in part of Articles dealing with other questions relating to the matters aforesaid ;

(b) that the Organic Articles to be incorporated in the By-Laws shall not be subject to change by the Commission, except that in so far as the Congress may from time to time vary the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the functions, composition and procedure of the Commisison, it shall be the duty of the Commission to amend the relevant Organic Articles to such extent as may be necessary to bring those Articles into harmony with the decisions so taken by the Congress ;

(c) that, in addition to, and subject to the provisions of, the Organic Articles, there may be included

in the By-Laws such provisions as the Commission may deem to be necessary or expedient relating (i) to the election of officers during inter-Congress periods and the duties to be assigned to each such officer, (ii) to the election of members of the Commission, (iii) to the methods to be followed in voting on matters requiring decision, and (iv) generally to any other matter concerning the conduct of the business of the Commission ;

(d) that, subject to (b) above, the Commission may at any time vary its By-Laws to such extent and subject to such conditions as it may from time to time decide to be necessary or appropriate ;

(e) that it shall be the duty of the Commission to make arrangements with the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature (the corporation responsible for the conduct of all financial matters on behalf of the Commission) for the By-Laws of the Commission to be printed by the Trust and for supplies of the By-Laws, so printed, at all times to be held available for sale.

Article 28 relative merits of the " first reviser " and " page precedence principles : Report by the Secretary

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion* 24)

17. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a Report (Point (85) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17) prepared by the Secretary to the Commission in response to a request made to him at the meeting noted in the margin, on the subject of the relative advantages of the " first reviser " and " page precedence " principles in relation to names (whether generic or trivial) published in the same book or paper for the same genus or species and to a single name when applied in such circumstances to different genera or to different species.

In this Report the Secretary both summarised the existing position in this matter and drew attention to the diversity of practice among zoologists. The Secretary concluded that the first essential was to redraft Article 28 in such a way as to eliminate all doubt regarding the requirements of the *Règles* on this question. Owing to the lack of uniformity in existing practice, some inconvenience was inevitable for individual workers if a common practice was now to be obtained for names in all parts of the Animal Kingdom. There were two important considerations which should be borne in mind : first, the importance of selecting the solution which would be both the most satisfactory on merits and would also be likely to lead to the minimum of inconvenience and disturbance of existing practice ; second, the need for adopting measures to minimise the

bad effects of such disturbance in existing practice as was inevitable, whatever solution was adopted. On the first of these points, the Secretary had reached the conclusion that the principle of page precedence was on merits greatly to be preferred to that of the first reviser, owing to the simplicity with which it could be applied, whereas in many cases the application of the second of these principles was a matter of difficulty and doubt; further, it appeared that a large and increasing number of zoologists were in fact already applying this principle, notwithstanding the present provisions of Article 28. On the second of the points to which he had drawn attention, the Secretary suggested that, where the adoption of the principle of page precedence would lead to hard cases, those hard cases should be met by the Commission through the use of their plenary powers.

A long discussion ensued on the Report submitted by the Secretary, in the course of which general support was expressed for the proposals submitted. Special consideration was given to the question whether the new provisions should be given retroactive effect or whether those provisions should apply only to those names, the relative status of which had not been determined under the existing provisions of Article 28 prior to a date to be specified in the *Règles*. It was realised, however, that, in view of the fact that a very large number of names were to-day treated as though the principle of page precedence were already enshrined in Article 28, a decision not to make the new provisions retroactive would fail to secure the desired object, for it would involve the widespread disturbance in existing nomenclatorial practice which it was the object of the Commission to avoid. Moreover, the lack of precision in the existing provisions of Article 28 in regard to the manner in which the "first reviser" principle was to be applied (for example, the difficulties often encountered in determining whether in a given work a given author had in fact acted as a first reviser) had led to doubt in many cases as to the way in which those provisions should be applied. On balance, therefore, it was felt that more harm than good would be done if the new provisions were to be brought into operation only as from some future date. At the conclusion of this part of the discussion, the Commission turned to consider the safeguards that could usefully be adopted to remedy the inconvenience arising from the disturbance in existing nomenclatorial practice in certain cases through the grant of retroactive effect to the principle of page precedence. It was generally agreed that it was desirable that there should be attached to the new provision a supplementary provision prohibiting the disturbance of existing practice, without the prior approval of the Commission, and recommending the

Commission to consider sympathetically applications for the use of their plenary powers in such cases to prevent disturbance of existing nomenclatorial practice, and, in particular, in the case of names of importance in medicine, agriculture, veterinary science and other applied fields of biology or in the teaching of zoology.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that in place of the provisions in Article 28 relating to names of the same date there be inserted in the *Règles* at an appropriate point provisions (a) that, where two or more names were published for the same taxonomic unit, or where the same name was published for more than one taxonomic unit, in the same book or serial or in the same part of any book or serial and were in consequence of identical date, the name printed on the earlier of the pages concerned is to have precedence over the name or names published on a later page, (b) that, where two or more such names are published on the same page, the name which appears on the line nearest to the top of the page is to have precedence over any name or names which appear lower down that page and (c) that, where two or more such names are printed in the same line, a name appearing earlier, is to have precedence over any name or names appearing later, in the same line ;

(2) that the provisions specified in (1) above should be subject to the following conditions :—

(a) that, where the application of the foregoing provision would lead to a change in the name of a taxonomic unit of importance, particularly in the fields of medicine, agriculture, veterinary science or other applied fields in biology or in the teaching of zoology, specialists may apply to the Commission for the use of its plenary powers to maintain existing nomenclatorial practice and that, on such an application having been submitted, no change in that practice should be made until the Commission's decision is made known ;

(b) that the said International Commission shall give sympathetic consideration to applications for the use of its plenary powers for the purpose of stabilising names, when requested to do so in accordance with (a) above ;

(3) that the existing *Recommandation* to Article 28, being inconsistent with the provisions now proposed to be inserted in that Article, should be deleted therefrom.

The use by the Commission of their plenary powers : supplementary provisions relating to procedure

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

18. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (Point (86) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17) that there should be included in the Schedule which it had been agreed at the meeting noted in the margin should be established for the recording of decisions taken by the Commission under their plenary powers particulars also of decisions taken by the Commission refusing applications for the use of those powers. It was proposed also that provision should be made for the automatic repeal, for all except historical purposes, of *Opinions* recording decisions taken by the Commission under their plenary powers when those decisions were recorded in a Schedule to the *Règles*.

There was general agreement that it was desirable that it should be made clear in an appropriate Schedule to the *Règles* what was the position where the Commission had been asked to use their plenary powers to validate one name by suppressing another but had come to the conclusion that the circumstances did not warrant the use of their plenary powers for the purpose in question. The view was expressed, however, that it was undesirable in such a case that the Commission should stop short by giving a negative decision of this kind. The proper course, it was felt, was that the Commission should in such a case take a positive decision on the issue involved by stating in their *Opinion* what was the name which should be used under the *Règles*, that name being at the same time added to the appropriate " Official List." It was this decision which should be recorded in the appropriate Schedule.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that, when in future the Commission refused to grant an application for the use of their plenary powers to validate a given name by suppressing another name, the *Opinion* to be rendered should not only record the refusal of the Commission to use their plenary powers in the manner proposed but should also state clearly what was the name which under the *Règles* should be used in the case in question ;

(2) to recommend :—

(a) that the provisions governing the use of the plenary powers should be amended to provide as specified in (1) above ;

(b) that, whenever a decision, whether validating or suppressing a given book, or a given name, was inscribed in the Schedule to the *Règles* which at the meeting noted in the margin it had been agreed to establish for the recording of such decisions, the *Opinion* in which that decision had originally been promulgated should be repealed for all except historical purposes;

(3) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to examine every *Opinion* so far rendered, in which an application for the use of the plenary powers had been rejected, with a view to the submission by him of proposals for the completion by the Commission of the decisions so recorded, where those decisions did not comply with the requirements specified in (1) above.

Decisions in regard to individual books or names taken by the Commission otherwise than under their plenary powers: record of, to be made in a Schedule to the "Règles"

(*Previous references: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3; *9th Meeting, Conclusion* 31)

19. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (Point (87) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17) that the decisions already taken during the present Session for the recording in Schedules to the *Règles* of decisions embodied in certain *Opinions* rendered by the Commission should be extended in such a way as to secure that every decision given in an *Opinion* rendered by the Commission in regard to the status of a given book or name or nomenclatorial usage (e.g. the determination of the type species of a given genus) should be recorded in an appropriate Schedule to the *Règles*. It had already been agreed at the Fourth Meeting of the Paris Session that all such decisions whether validating or suppressing a given book, name or usage taken by the Commission under its plenary powers should be so recorded, while at the Ninth Meeting of the same Session it had been agreed that a similar record should be made of every decision where the Commission ruled that a given book or name was not available under the *Règles*. In order to complete the system of record so begun, it was desirable that there should be recorded in the appropriate Schedule a record of every affirmative decision taken by the Commission, otherwise than under their plenary powers, i.e. every decision that a given book or name was available under the *Règles*. It was proposed also that, on the transfer to the Schedule concerned of any decision relating to the status, whether available or unavailable, of a given book or name, the *Opinion* in which that decision had originally been promulgated should be repealed for all except historical purposes.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that the decision taken at the Ninth Meeting of their Paris Session that there should be established a Schedule in which should be recorded every decision taken by the Commission that a given book or a given name was not available under the *Règles* (that is to say every such decision other than a decision taken by the Commission under their plenary powers) should be extended in such a way as to provide also that every such decision, affirming that a given book or name or nomenclatorial usage was available under the *Règles* or, as the case may be, correct thereunder should be recorded in the said Schedule ;

(2) that, whenever a decision falling in the classes specified in (1) above was inscribed in the Schedule to the *Règles* concerned, the *Opinion* in which that decision had originally been promulgated should be repealed for all except historical purposes.

" Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology " and corresponding Indexes of Rejected and Invalid Names : establishment of Schedules to the " Règles " for reception of

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusions* 41 *and* 42)

20. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (Point (88) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17) that two further Schedules should be added to the *Règles* for the reception respectively of the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " and the " Official List of Specific Names in Zoology," and matters consequential thereto.

There was general agreement that, now that (as agreed at the meeting noted in the margin) a provision was to be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing and defining the scope of the two " Official Lists," it was desirable that entries of names on those " Lists " should be formally recorded in the manner proposed. It was recalled that, since the present proposal had been drafted, the Commission had proposed, and the Section on Nomenclature had agreed, that the title of the second of these " Official Lists " should be changed to that of " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology." It would be necessary therefore to make a corresponding change in the decision to be taken on the present proposal.

The Commission were informed that, in the preparations which had already been made for the publication of the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " in book form there had been added to that " List " an " Index " of rejected and invalid names, giving particulars of all names which the Commission had either suppressed under their plenary powers or had declared were otherwise unavailable

under the *Règles*. This course had been taken because it had been felt that it was only in this way that it would be possible to provide a readily accessible alphabetical list of such names. From the point of view of working zoologists a knowledge of decisions taken by the Commission either suppressing, or declaring invalid, individual names was just as important as a knowledge of the corresponding affirmative decisions. It was accordingly suggested that the Schedules now proposed to be established should be divided into two parts, the first part, in each case, for the reception of the "Official List" concerned, the second for the reception of the corresponding Index of rejected and invalid names.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that further Schedules should be added to the *Règles* for the reception respectively of the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" and that Indexes of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names and of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names should either be added to the respective Schedules concerned or should be recorded in further Schedules, whichever might be found the more convenient;

(2) that, in order to prevent the volume containing the *Règles* and the Schedules thereto already agreed to be established from becoming too bulky, the Schedules referred to in (1) above should be published separately from time to time in parts;

(3) that, on the forthcoming publication of the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" (already in the press), the volume so formed should constitute the first instalment of the relevant Schedule referred to above, and that, as from the date of the publication of that volume, all the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission in relation to names recorded in the Schedule concerned should be repealed for all except historical purposes;

(4) that, as and when sufficient further names should have been added to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" or to the "Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names" or should have been placed on the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" or on the corresponding "Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names", further instalments in the first case and instalments in the second case should be added

to the appropriate Schedule and thereupon published as further instalments of the supplementary volumes of the *Règles*, as prescribed in (2) above and that the *Opinions* in which the decisions that the names in question should be placed on an Official List or Index, as the case might be, had been originally published should thereupon be repealed for all except historical purposes.

Incorporation in Schedules to the " Règles " of decisions given in " Opinions " : preliminary cancellation and amendment of certain " Opinions " already published

21. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (Point (89) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17) that, prior to the incorporation in Schedules to the *Règles* of decisions embodied in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission, certain of the *Opinions* in question should be cancelled, because they had either never been correct or were no longer correct, and that certain other of those *Opinions* should be amended in certain respects.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the undermentioned *Opinions* should, for the reasons severally specified below, be cancelled except for historical purposes :—

(a) *Opinion* 9 (" The use of the name of a composite genus for a component part requiring a name "), because it contained no effective decision ;

(b) *Opinions* 23 and 24 (" *Aspro* versus *Cheilodipterus* or *Ambassis* " and " *Antennarius* Commerson, 1798, and Cuvier, 1817, versus *Histrio* Fischer, 1813 "), the decision in each of which was incorrect, being based upon an erroneous interpretation of the expression " nomenclature binaire " as hitherto used in the *Règles;*

(c) *Opinion* 32 (" The type of the genus *Sphex* "), because it had been rendered superfluous and misleading by the later decision by the Commission in *Opinion* 180 to designate the type species of this genus under their plenary powers ;

(d) *Opinion* 44 (" *Leptocephalus* versus *Conger* "), because it had been rendered superfluous and misleading by the later decision taken by the Commission in *Opinion* 89 to suppress " Gronow, 1763 " under their plenary powers ;

(e) *Opinion* 74 ("Apstein's (1915) List of Nomina Conservanda"), because it dealt with a bygone question of procedure and not with nomenclature;

(f) *Opinion* 133 ("*Urothoe* Dana and Phoxocephalidae Sars"), because the decision obscurely stated in that *Opinion* had later been stated with precision in *Opinion* 141;

(2) that, as regards *Opinion* 76 ("Status of *Pyrosoma* versus *Monophora; . . . Appendicularia* and *Fritillaria*"), the decision recorded in the second sentence of the "summary" should be preserved, but that the remainder of the *Opinion* should be cancelled, as being no longer correct and not suitable for incorporation in a Schedule to the *Règles;*

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

(3) that, in view of the fact that the decision of principle enunciated in the first sentence of the "Summary" of *Opinion* 83 ("*Acanthiza pyrrhopygia* Vigors and Horsfield, 1827, versus *Acanthiza pyrrhopygia* Gould, 1848") was now to be clearly laid down in the *Règles*, there was no need to record in the Schedule to the *Règles* the now self-evident proposition set out in the second sentence and therefore that this *Opinion* should be cancelled except for historical purposes;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 26)

(4) that, on the incorporation in the *Règles* of the decision of principle recorded in the first sentence of the "Summary" of *Opinion* 88 ("*Otarion diffractum* versus *Cyphaspis burmeisteri*") in the manner agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, the decision recorded in the second sentence of the "summary" should be preserved when the above *Opinion* was cancelled for all except historical purposes, subject to the substitution therein, of the word "available" for the word "valid," the former expression being one to be reserved for nomenclatorial considerations while the latter was to be reserved for taxonomic matters;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 46)

(5) that, on the incorporation in the *Règles*, and the consequent cancellation, of the interpretative portion of the first sentence of the "Summary" of *Opinion* 102 ("*Protocephala* Blainville, 1828, versus *Protocephalus* Weinland, 1858") in the manner agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, the remaining portion of this *Opinion*

should be cancelled, that portion being concerned not with nomenclature but with taxonomy ;

(6) that the decision regarding the name *Echinocyamus pusillus* Müller (O.F.), 1776, recorded in the last two lines of the " Summary " of *Opinion* 107 (" *Echinocyamus pusillus* versus *Echinocyamus minutus* ") should be entered in the appropriate Schedule to the *Règles* and the remainder of the *Opinion* cancelled ;

(7) that, on the incorporation in the appropriate Schedule of the decision embodied in *Opinion* 113 (" *Sarcoptes* Latreille, 1802, type *scabiei*, placed on the ' Official List ' "), the date given for the generic name *Sarcoptes* Latreille should be amended, that name dating from a year calculated according to the French Revolutionary Calendar and therefore in a period overlapping into two years calculated in accordance with the Christian era.

" Opinions " 31, 68, 69, 78, 99, 129 : supplementary decisions in regard to

22. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the first four of the six proposals relating to *Opinions* previously rendered by the Commission submitted in Point (90) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the erroneous decision in *Opinion* 31 in regard to the type species of the genus *Columbina* Spix should be cancelled and that there should be substituted therefor the amended decision suggested by the late Dr. Stejneger and published in 1911 (the year following the issue of the erroneous decision referred to above) as a footnote to the first page of *Opinion* 38 ;

(2) as regards *Opinion* 68 (" The type species of *Pleuronectes* Linnaeus, 1758 ") and *Opinion* 69 (" The type species of *Sparus* Linnaeus, 1758 ") :—

(a) that the incomplete and unhelpful decisions given in the foregoing *Opinions* should be supplemented as soon as possible by *Opinions* specifying the type species of the genera concerned and placing the generic and trivial names concerned on the relevant " Official Lists " ;

(b) that the Secretary to the Commission be invited to confer with specialists for the purpose of submitting proposals to the Commission to give effect to the decision recorded in (a) above ;

(c) that on the publication of the supplementary *Opinions* referred to in (a) above, the decisions so rendered should be inserted in the appropriate Schedules to the *Règles* and *Opinions* 68 and 69 repealed for all except historical purposes ;

(3) that, as regards *Opinion* 97 (" Did Hübner's Tentamen, 1806, create monotypic genera ? "), the entry to be made in the appropriate Schedule should be that this leaflet was not published within the meaning of Article 25 and therefore that the new names which appeared therein did not acquire availability as from the date on which copies of that leaflet were distributed by its author ;

(4) as regards *Opinion* 78 (" Case of *Dermacentor andersoni* versus *Dermacentor venustus* ") and *Opinion* 99 (" *Endamoeba* Leidy, 1897, versus *Entamoeba* Casagrandi and Barbagallo, 1895 ") :—

(a) that the decisions given in the foregoing *Opinions* should be reviewed by the Commission as soon as possible ;

(b) that, pending the conclusion of the review referred to in (a) above, the decisions recorded in the foregoing *Opinions* should not be incorporated in the Schedules to the *Règles;*

(c) that a statement should be issued announcing the decisions recorded in (a) and (b) above, stating that, pending the completion of the review specified in (a) above, the matters dealt with respectively in *Opinion* 78 and *Opinion* 99 are to be treated as being *sub judice*, and inviting specialists to communicate to the Commission their views on the action to be taken by way of confirming, modifying or reversing the decisions recorded in those *Opinions*.

Suppression of names under the plenary powers : principles to be followed

23. THE COMMISSION had under consideration (1) a proposal that the scope of the decision given in *Opinion* 129 to suppress the generic name *Bipinnaria* Sars, 1835, and certain other generic names published by that author should be clarified and (2) that the Commission should lay down for their future guidance the relative extent to which names should be suppressed under their plenary powers (*a*) when the object of suppressing a given name is to validate the later use of that name in some other sense, and (*b*) when the

object of suppressing the name in question is to validate some other name (fifth and sixth proposals submitted in Point (90) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17).

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that there should be inserted in the Article embodying the plenary powers a provision prescribing that the following principles are to be followed by the Commission, when suppressing a generic name or a specific or other trivial name under those powers :—

(*a*) Where a name is suppressed for the purpose of validating the use, in some other sense, of the name in question as published at some later date, the name so suppressed is to be suppressed absolutely, so far as concerns its publication by the author, and in the work, cited at the time of its being suppressed, that is to say a name so suppressed is to be suppressed both for the purposes of Article 25 (Law of Priority) and for the purposes of Article 34 (in the case of a generic name) and Article 35 (in the case of a trivial name) (Law of Homonymy) ;

(*b*) Where a name is suppressed for the purpose of validating some later name given to the same taxonomic unit, the name in question is to be suppressed for the purposes only of Article 25 (Law of Priority) and is to retain its rights under Article 34 (in the case of a generic name) and Article 35 (in the case of a trivial name) (Law of Homonymy) ;

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 3)

(2) that the principles specified in (1) above are to be applied retrospectively to decisions already taken by the Commission for the suppression of names under their plenary powers, before the decisions in question were recorded in the appropriate Schedule to the *Règles* in the manner agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin.

Schedules to the " Règles " : procedure to be followed in the transfer thereto of decisions recorded in " Opinions " rendered by the Commission

24. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal, submitted in Point (91) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17, in regard (1) to the method to be adopted in citing names when entries in regard thereto were transferred from *Opinions* to the appropriate Schedule of the *Règles* and (2) to the procedure to be followed in correcting any errors in *Opinions* on questions of fact which might be detected in the course of such transfer.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to invite the Secretary to the Commission as soon as possible after the conclusion of the present Congress (a) to examine in detail (i) the *Opinions* so far rendered by the Commission and (ii) the *Official Record of the Proceedings of the Commission* during its present Session, and (b) on the basis of that examination, to construct for insertion in the *Règles*, as amended by the present Congress, the Schedules recording decisions taken by the Commission in regard to individual books and individual names, which it had been agreed to attach to the *Règles* so amended ;

(2) that, when, in accordance with (1) above, any name on which a decision had been taken by the Commission was so placed in a Schedule to the *Règles*:—

(*a*) the name so transferred should be correctly cited and there should be inserted the bibliographical reference to the place of publication of that name and, in the case of a generic name, the bibliographical reference both to the place where the name of the type species was first published and to the place where that species was designated, indicated or selected to be the type species of the genus in question ;

(*b*) in the case of a specific trivial name, the generic name, in combination with which that name was originally published (a particular commonly omitted from the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission) should be inserted ;

(3) that, if, when the Secretary to the Commission re-examined the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission with a view to the transfer of their contents to the Schedules to the *Règles*, that Officer were to find errors or obscurities additional to those dealt with in Conclusions 21 and 22 of the present Meeting, he should at once submit particulars of the cases concerned to the Commission and that the Commission should treat as a matter of urgency the correction of such errors, in order to avoid any unnecessary delay in the publication of the *Règles* as revised by the present Congress and to this end should eliminate all procedural delays, if necessary under suspension of the By-laws.

" Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " : gender of generic names to be specified in

25. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal, submitted in Point (92) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17, that there should be inserted in the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " a statement of the gender of every name placed on that " List."

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the provisions relating to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology " to be inserted in the *Règles* should prescribe *inter alia*:—

(a) that every *Opinion* rendered hereafter in which a name or names were added to the said " Official List " should specify the gender of the name or names concerned ;

(b) that, when any instalment of the Schedule containing the foregoing " Official List ", is published, there should be added thereto an alphabetical list of all the names comprised therein and that against each generic name so recorded should be specified its gender.

Revision of the "Règles" by the Paris Congress : arrangements to be made for early promulgation and entry into force

26. THE COMMISSION had under consideration proposals (Point (93) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17) in regard to the arrangements to be made for the early promulgation and consequent entry into force of the revision of the *Règles* carried through by the present (Paris) Congress.

There was complete agreement in the discussion which took place on the foregoing proposals that it was of the utmost importance that the text of the *Règles*, as revised by the present Congress, should be promulgated and brought into operation at the earliest possible moment. Working zoologists all over the world would quickly learn that valuable improvements had been made in the *Règles* at the Paris Congress ; they would be anxious to secure the benefit of those improvements in their current work but would not be able to do so until the revised text had been promulgated. As suggested in the present proposal, such zoologists would however be able to guide themselves in their work even before the revised text of the *Règles* was available as soon as the detailed record of the Paris decisions was made available by the publication of the Minutes of the Paris Session in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. Every possible effort should therefore be made to expedite the publication of this record. Zoologists had had to wait far too long already for the reform of the *Règles* and now that an important step in that direction had at last been made, it was essential that every worker should be able to take advantage of the progress so made at the earliest possible moment.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) that the Minutes of the meetings of the Commission during their Paris Session should be so drafted as to give a full and detailed account of the decisions taken during that Session and that these Minutes, together with the supporting documents in the light of which many of those decisions had been taken and also the Reports to be submitted by the Commission to the present (Paris) Congress at its final Plenary Session, should be published as soon as possible in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature;*

(2) to recommend :—

(*a*) that, when the documents specified in (1) above were published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in the manner there prescribed, they should be prefaced by a short note explaining the arrangements in hand for the early publication of the revised *Règles* and advising all zoologists thenceforward to guide themselves in their work by reference to the decisions recorded in the Minutes of the meetings of the Commission and thus proceed as though the revised *Règles* were already published ;

(*Previous reference : Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion* 12)

(*b*) that the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature (the corporate body charged with the duty of undertaking all financial work on behalf of the Commission) should be requested in the name of the Congress to publish the revised text of the *Règles*, as soon as that text had been approved in the manner which had been agreed upon, and that the *Règles*, as revised by the Paris Congress, should formally enter into force as from the date on which they are so published ;

(*c*) that an Article should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing the date of their entry into force as from the date specified in (*b*) above.

Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the " Règles " : sixth instalment

27. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission (Commission Paper I.C.(48)18) containing a sixth instalment of miscellaneous proposals received from various sources for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. For convenience of reference, these proposals, which were ten in number, had been numbered consecutively with the proposals brought

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 12)

forward in the paper containing the fifth instalment (Commission Paper I.C.(48)17). The present proposals were therefore numbered (94) to (103).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to examine Commission Paper I.C.(48)18, point by point, for the purpose of reaching conclusions regarding the recommendations to be submitted on the questions raised therein.

Article 35 (a trivial name not to be rejected as a homonym where two species having that name are placed in different genera which, through the accident of undetected generic homonymy, bear the same generic name)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

28. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (94) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18, further regarding the provisions to be inserted in the *Règles* in the Articles which it had been agreed at the meeting noted in the margin should replace the existing text of Article 35 relating to specific homonymy. The question raised by the Secretary was concerned with the status of a specific trivial name in a case where two species having identical trivial names were either originally described, or subsequently placed, in different genera but where those genera, through the accident of an undetected generic homonymy, bore the same name as one another.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that, when the Commission had considered this matter in relation to the proposals submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8, they had reached the conclusion, though with some hesitation, that on balance it was desirable that in a case of the kind under discussion the later published of the two identical specific names should be rejected as a homonym of the earlier published name. Since the meeting at which this conclusion had been reached, Commissioner Chester Bradley had suggested that it would be well if this matter were further considered by the Commission. As a preliminary to such further consideration, he (the Acting President) had re-examined the issues involved, and, as the Commission would see from the note which he had circulated, he had come to the conclusion that this type of case should be treated as falling within the field of generic homonymy (Article 34) rather than that of specific homonymy (Article 35). He accordingly suggested that the Commission should modify the view which they had previously taken in this matter and should recommend the Congress to approve an alternative proposal under which a specific or subspecific name would not be liable to rejection as a homonym in a case where two species or subspecies were originally described, or subsequently placed, in different genera, which, however, through the

accident of undetected generic homonymy, bore the same generic name. If this recommendation commended itself to the Commission, the desired end could be secured by modifying the definitions proposed to be given to the expressions " primary homonym " and " secondary homonym " respectively. In order, however, to prevent the risk of any misunderstanding in this matter, it might be advantageous to include in the *Règles* an express provision on this subject, even though this would not really be necessary if the foregoing definitions were amended in the sense suggested.

IN A SHORT DISCUSSION which ensued, general agreement was expressed with the proposal submitted, it being felt that it would be ritualistic to treat a specific name as a homonym in a case where that species had never been placed in a genus containing a species having the same trivial name, the existence of an older identical binominal combination as the specific name for another species being due solely to an undetected case of generic homonymy.

THE COMMISSION :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 1)

(1) agreed to substitute for the recommendation agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin in regard to the status to be accorded under the *Règles* to the name of a species or subspecies having a trivial name identical with that of another species or subspecies which, though not originally described, or subsequently placed, in the same genus, was so described or placed in a genus which, through the accident of undetected generic homonymy, bore the same generic name, a recommendation for the insertion in the *Règles* of a provision which would secure that in such a case the later published of the two trivial names should not be rejected on grounds of homonymy with the earlier published name ;

(2) agreed, in view of (1) above, to recommend :—

(a) that the reference to cases of apparent specific homonymy arising from an undetected generic homonymy should be deleted from :—

(i) the definition of the expressions " primary homonym " and " secondary homonym " recommended for insertion in the *Règles* under Section (2) of the First Conclusion adopted by the Commission at the Sixth of the

Meetings held during their Paris Session ;

(ii) the Section of the foregoing Conclusion numbered (18);

(b) that the section of the conclusion referred to in (a)(i) above, numbered (11) should be deleted ;

(c) that there should be inserted at an appropriate point in the *Règles* a provision that, where two species or subspecies bearing identical trivial names are either originally described, or subsequently placed, in different genera which, through the accident of undetected generic homonymy, bear or formerly bore the same generic name, the later published of the two trivial names is not to be rejected on grounds of homonymy with the earlier published trivial name an example being cited.

Article 25, Proviso (*a*) (meaning of the expression " indication " in relation to generic and trivial names) : amplification of previous decision relating to

29. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by the Secretary (Point (95) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18) that a slight amplification should be made in the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin to codify the decision relating to the interpretation of the expression " indication " as used in Proviso (a) to Article 25 in its relation to specific names given by the Commission in their *Opinion* 1. Through an inadvertence in the drafting of that *Opinion*, a trivial name published as a substitute for a previously published trivial name would be held to have been published with an " indication " even if the name so replaced had been a *nomen nudum*. Similar considerations applied to generic names so published.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that their recommendation agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin regarding the incorporation in Article 25 of the interpretation of the expression " indication " as used in Proviso (a) to that Article in relation to specific trivial names should be amplified by the insertion of words to make it clear that a trivial name published as a substitute for an earlier but invalid trivial name is to be treated as having been published with an " indication ", only if the name so replaced had itself been published with a description or definition or indication and that a corresponding provision should be inserted in Article 25 in relation to generic names similarly published.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 21)

Article 30 (species eligible for selection as the type species where no nominal species was distinctly referred to the genus by its original author): amplification of previous decision relating to

30. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by the Secretary (Point (96) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18) that a slight amplification should be made in the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin to insert in Article 30 words to give effect to the ruling given in the last sentence of the "Summary" of *Opinion* 46 on the subject of the species to be regarded as the type species of a genus originally published with no nominal species distinctly referred to it. Through an inadvertence in the drafting of this portion of *Opinion* 46, the decision there given was incomplete, for, although that *Opinion* provided for the case where some later author placed one but not more than one species in such a genus, it contained no provision for the case where the first subsequent author to place a species in such a genus placed in it two or more species.

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 39)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that their recommendation agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin regarding the insertion in the *Règles* of words to make it clear what species should be regarded as the type species of a genus originally established with no nominal species distinctly referred thereto should be amplified by the insertion of words providing that, where the first subsequent author to refer such species to such a genus referred to it two or more such species and did not designate or indicate one of those species to be the type species, the species so referred become for the purposes of Article 30 the sole originally included species, from which alone therefore the type species of the genus may be selected by a subsequent author.

Article 30 (clarification of certain ambiguities in)

31. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the position as regards the selection of a species to be the type species of a nominal genus which arose in cases where the author selecting that species referred not to the occasion on which the generic name in question had first been published in conditions which satisfied the requirements of Articles 25 and 26 of the *Règles* but to some other occasion on which the name in question had been published either prior to 1758 or subsequent both to 1757 and to the date on which the name was first validly published within the meaning of the Articles of the *Règles* referred to above, together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in Point (97) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18. It was pointed out that in the case of the earlier generic names, later authors in the XIXth century when selecting type species, had not infrequently attributed those names either to the

wrong author or to some work by the correct author other than that in which he first validly published the name in question, with the result, in either case, that the originally included species (from which alone the type species could be selected) might not be, and often in fact were not, the same as those placed in the genera concerned, when the generic names in question were first validly published. It was proposed that words should be inserted in Article 30 to make clear the position in this matter. Again, in some cases, authors, when selecting the type species of a genus, the name of which had first been published before 1758 (i.e. prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature, as defined by Article 26), had attributed that name to the work of some author which had been published before the year 1758. In this class of case also the effect was to give the appearance of eligibility for selection as the type species of the genus in question to species, which had not been included in the genus at the later date subsequent to 1757 when the generic name was first published in conditions which satisfied the requirements of Articles 25 and 26, and which therfore were in fact ineligible for being so selected. Rule (g) in Article 30 expressly laid it down that that rule was to be applied " rigorously ", and it could not be claimed that this injunction had been complied with, when a type selection was based upon the use of the generic name in question in some work other than that in which it was first validly published. Still less could it be claimed that the foregoing provision in Rule (g) had been complied with, when the type selection was based upon the use of the generic name in question prior to 1758, i.e. before the starting point of zoological nomenclature. It was proposed that words should be inserted in Article 30 to make it clear that this kind of procedure did not comply with the requirements of Rule (g) in Article 30 and accordingly that any type selection so made was to be rejected.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear :—

(a) that Article 30 relates only to the designation, indication or selection of the type species of a nominal genus published subsequent to 31st December, 1757, that is to say to the name of a genus as originally published subsequent to the above date by a given author in a given work, and that the action then taken by that author is alone relevant to the question :—

(i) of what species are to be regarded as having been originally included in the

genus concerned for the purposes of Rules (e), (f) or (g) in the foregoing Article ; or

(ii) of whether the type species of the genus in question is to be treated as having been designated under Rules (a), (b), (c) or (d) of the foregoing Article at the time of the original publication of the generic name concerned ;

(b) that no selection of the type species for a given nominal genus, which is related to any publication of the name of that genus other than its first valid publication by its author or, as the case may be, the first subsequent such publication in which one or more species were distinctly referred to the genus so named, is to be accepted as a selection of the type species of that genus for the purposes of Rule (g) in Article 30.

Subspecific trivial names : position where, on being first published, such a name is preceded by a serial letter or by a serial numeral

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 14)

32. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the position of subspecific trivial names originally published in lists in which they were preceded by serial letters (file Z.N.(S.)352), submitted in Point (98) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18. It was desirable that it should be made clear in the *Règles* that, where a subspecific trivial name was published in the foregoing circumstances, the serial letter by which it was preceded, when originally published, did not form part of the name in question.

It was pointed out that this proposal did no more than apply to the trivial names of subspecies the decision already taken in regard to the trivial names of species. As in the case of the latter class of name, the decision now to be taken should apply to names preceded by serial numerals as well as to names preceded by serial letters.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where a subspecific name was first published in a list in which the trivial name of the subspecies was preceded by either a serial letter or a serial numeral, that letter or numeral did not form part of the trivial name in question.

Revision of the " Règles " by the Paris Congress : date of entry into force

33. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) explained that the next Point in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18 (namely Point (99)) had been inserted by inadvertence, the question of the date of entry into force of the *Règles* as revised by the present Congress (with which

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion* 26)

this Point was concerned) having been dealt with in the earlier Point (93) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)17. The Commission had now taken a decision on the question raised in Point (93) and in consequence no action was required on Point (99).

THE COMMISSION took note of the above statement.

Article 34 and " Opinion " 116 (position as regards homonymy of generic names differing from one another only by the terminations "nus" and "-mus")

34. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 34 (relating to generic homonymy) and *Opinion* 116 (which laid it down that two generic names differing from one another by having in the one case the termination " *-nus* " and in the other case the termination " *-mus* " were not to be regarded as being homonyms of one another) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in Point (100) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18.

In the discussion of this question the view was expressed that it was not necessary or desirable to insert in the *Règles* provisions recording negative decisions such as that given in *Opinion* 116, in view of the fact that it had been agreed to recommend that words should be inserted in Article 34 to make it clear that the list of differences in spelling which were to be ignored in determining whether one generic name was a homonym of another which (through the codification of the decision given in *Opinion* 147) was now to be inserted in that Article was an exhaustive list. Thus, it followed automatically that generic names which differed from one another in spelling in any way not specified in that list were not to be treated as being homonyms of one another.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 43)

(1) that, having regard to the fact that the list of differences in spelling in generic names which, at the meeting noted in the margin, it had been agreed should be inserted in Article 34 was to be treated as an exhaustive list, no advantage would be served by inserting in the *Règles* express provisions regarding differences in spelling which were not to be regarded as making one generic name a homonym of another ;

(2) that, in view of the decision on the question of principle involved recorded in (1) above, the interpretation of Article 34 given in *Opinion* 116 was now superfluous and therefore that the portion of that *Opinion* containing that interpretation should now be repealed for all except historical purposes.

Article 25 (status of a name first published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes) : amplification of previous decision

(*Previous references: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusions* 47 *and* 18)

35. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by the Secretary (in Point (101) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18) that the decision taken by the Commission when incorporating in the *Règles* the ruling given by the Commission in *Opinion* 145 (on the status of generic names and specific trivial names when those names are first published in works rejected for nomenclatorial purposes) (a problem discussed in paragraph 45 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11) should be amplified to bring it completely into line with the decision previously taken at the same meeting to incorporate in the *Règles* the ruling given by the Commission in *Opinion* 4 (regarding the status of manuscript names) (a problem discussed in paragraph 12 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11) by making it clear that, until such names are (i) validly published and (ii) so published with an indication, their status is exactly the same as that of a manuscript name.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that their recommendation for the incorporation in the *Règles* of the ruling given in *Opinion* 145 (Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 47) should be amplified to make it clear that, where a name is first published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes, that name, until (i) validly published and (ii) so published with an indication, has a status identical with that of a manuscript name, that is to say the status specified in the ruling given in *Opinion* 4, which it had already been agreed should be incorporated in the *Règles* (Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 18).

Article 25 (status of a generic name when first published in a specific synonymy)

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion* 24)

36. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the question of the status of a generic name first published as the generic component of a binominal combination constituting a specific name cited in a specific synonymy, together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in Point (102) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)18.

It was pointed out that generic names originally published by pre-1758 authors and quoted as part of a specific name by post-1757 authors when giving specific synonymies were already ruled out by the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin to incorporate in the *Règles* the ruling given in *Opinion* 5, for a pre-1758 generic name so published after 1757 was neither adopted nor accepted by the author by whom it was so republished. There were two other classes of generic names which might appear in a specific synonymy, namely (1) a name published after 1757

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume is devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July* 1948. Twenty-one Parts have been published and this volume is now complete except for the index which will be published in a concluding Part.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July* 1948, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

Printed in Great Britain by METCHIM AND SON, LTD., Westminster London